THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by Canon E. G. Selwyn, D.D., Redhill Rectory, Rowlands Castle, Hants, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XX MAY, 1930 No. 119

EDITORIAL

THE LAMBETH AGENDA

Across every continent and ocean at this time members of the Anglican episcopate are making their way to the great Conference, the seventh of its kind, to be held at Lambeth in July. On the last occasion of its meeting the world was still trembling from the convulsions of the Great War, which was even then barely concluded; and it was a veritable whispering-gallery for any word of heavenly hope and charity that might speak to its condition. To-day, though a number of political instruments have done much to remove war from our field of vision, the world is not less perplexed than then, nor less expectant. Faith and Freedom, two of the most cherished gifts of the Christian community to mankind, are felt to be in jeopardy. Freedom, the essential note of man's spiritual stature, is menaced by a process of mechanization which is laying its iron hand with firmer grasp each year on every aspect of man's life, economic, aesthetic, and political. Faith finds itself challenged by a secularism which, as the Jerusalem Conference of last year showed, is nothing less than a world-wide religion, whose idol is Mammon. If in Russia the issue is joined with a realism and a hardness of outline not felt elsewhere, the conflict is in greater or less degree universal. For it is a spiritual conflict, the clash of supernatural forces; Michael and his angels fighting against the dragon. At such a juncture the first task of the Lambeth Conference is clear: *it is to strengthen faith.*

A glance at the Agenda of the Conference will show how well adapted it is to serve this end.

AGENDA

THE FAITH AND WITNESS OF THE CHURCH IN THIS GENERATION.

I. THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF GOD—

(*a*) In relation to modern thought.
(*b*) In relation to non-Christian religions and ideals.
(*c*) As determining the character of Christian worship.
(*d*) To be realized throughout the Church by teaching and study.

II. THE LIFE AND WITNESS OF THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY—

Individual and corporate, in the fulfilment of the Divine purpose, with special reference to questions of:

(*a*) Marriage.
(*b*) Sex.
(*c*) Race.
(*d*) Education and Government.
(*e*) Peace and War.

III. THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH.

(*a*) Report of results of the Lambeth Appeal, 1920. World Conference on Faith and Order.
(*b*) Schemes and Proposals of Union.
(*c*) Relations of the Anglican Communion with particular Churches.

IV. THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION.

(*a*) Its ideal and future.
(*b*) Its organization and authority.
(1) Central.
(2) National and Provincial.
(3) Missionary Dioceses, under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury. (Questions of Church Order with regard to Forms of Worship and Rules of Marriage.)

V. THE MINISTRY.

(*a*) Supply of men for Holy Orders, and the Church's duty to provide for it.
(*b*) The training of clergy before and after Ordination.
(*c*) Supplementary Ministries.
(1) Deaconesses.
(2) Voluntary Clergy.

Reports:
Women's Work, Resolution 54, Lambeth Conference, 1920.
Healing, Resolution 63, Lambeth Conference, 1920.
Communities, Resolution 57, Lambeth Conference, 1920.

VI. YOUTH AND ITS VOCATION.

We have said that this Agenda is well adapted to the end of strengthening faith; for its first section declares plainly the main issue, and it is to be presumed that the remainder will be approached in the light of it. The great need of today, for the Church almost more than for the world, is God. We do not share the view that the secularism of our time disguises a wide-

spread and conscious groping after religion: it seems to us too complacent and (from its own standpoint) too successful an affair for that. But this very condition, which in its higher forms expresses itself in the modern Epicureanism of Mr. Walter Lippmann's *A Preface to Morals*, and in its lower forms is frankly utilitarian and pleasure-seeking, lays upon the Church more urgently than ever the necessity of a single, clear, authoritative witness to God. It is no accident that this has been the burden of the deepest and most prophetic voices that have spoken since the Lambeth Conference last met. We think especially of Baron von Hügel, whose first series of *Essays and Addresses* appeared in 1921; of Karl Barth, the most living teacher in the Protestantism of Germany; of Dr. Temple, Fr. Thornton, Professor Taylor, and Professor Webb, whose contributions to Christian theism have shown that the heritage of Bishop Butler is still secure in the Church of England; of Maritain in France, who has found no unworthy colleagues over here in Mr. T. S. Eliot and his friends of *The Criterion*.*

Two principles stand out in this theology. On the one hand there is the emphasis on the otherness, prevenience, and abiding reality of God. In contrast to the subjectivism of much modern religion, with its gush and hurry and cheap appeals to the emotions, it testifies to God as the *mysterium tremendum et fascinans* who gives to Catholic worship its "objective" character, and to Catholic theology its richness of content, its carefulness of formulation, and its synthetic power. It rests upon the "Word," or revelation, of God; presupposes and vitalizes the Creeds as the expression of the Church's appropriation of that revelation in experience; and under the impulse of its passionate belief that nature no less than supernature comes from, and belongs to, the one and only true God, reaches out to co-ordinate, so far as it may, the various fields of man's experience and knowledge and his diverse approaches to reality. For that is the second feature of this theology, particularly on its Anglican side—its passion for synthesis. Welcoming all that the philosophy of science is discovering of the organic principle in the universe, it claims that this points to the spiritual order; that as the physical is taken up into the physiological order, and that again into the human and historical order, so is this last order taken up into the spiritual; and that this taking up of manhood into God, or conversely this coming down of God into man, is

* A quarterly review, edited by T. S. Eliot. Faber and Faber. 30s. per annum. The importance of this review lies in the detachment and objectivity of its criticism. It would be too much to say that Catholic principles permeate it, though they are well represented: what does permeate it is a standpoint which is always potentially Catholic, and often actually so.

uniquely, representatively, and causatively accomplished in Christ, and through Christ in the community that partakes of His Spirit, bears His Name, and is His Body.

To say that such a theology is at once Catholic and liberal is simply to say that it is in the widest sense synthetic; Catholic, in its attempt to co-ordinate all that is given to us in revelation and in religious experience; liberal, in its insistence that the natural world too, and our experience and knowledge of it, and the critical activities of the mind which lead to that knowledge, derive from God Himself. Readers of this Journal are familiar with the view that the future of theology, and especially of Anglican theology, is bound up with Liberal Catholicism; and yet the two terms of the title seem almost to imply a dualism which is unreal. Religious experience, for instance, is not a separated kind of experience, but rather the total experience of life which a religious man has; while criticism is an activity of mind not confined to secular fields only, but proper also—*teste Origene, teste S. Thoma ipso*—to the deepest mysteries of the faith. Catholic theology, in other words, cannot be truly Catholic unless it be liberal. And, by the same token, it cannot but eschew controversy, when possible; for controversy blinds the eye to synthesis, even though it may minister to it in the end. One of the advantages inherent in the first subject of the Lambeth Agenda is that it will give the Anglican episcopate an unrivalled opportunity of such a statement of the Christian doctrine of God as may lead the minds and hearts of men throughout the world to a fresh attitude of common adoration, submission, and love. It will be a great thing that Lambeth should open up the divine Wisdom, that orders and over-rules all things and unveils to man's scientific quest the relations that bind together the world of His creating. It will be a great thing, too, that Lambeth should trace the operations of the divine Power, and show how man's blindness and weakness—so beautifully portrayed in Mr. Thornton Wilder's *The Woman of Andros*—find their true tonic and illumination in God's redeeming grace in Christ. But the greatest thing of all would be that Lambeth should so speak of the divine Charity that men shall know that there, and there only, in the tranquillity of His truth and the righteousness of His will, is our certitude, security, and peace.

The treatment of the problem of worship will have a special importance in this regard. Our own liturgical controversies of recent years, for instance, will appear in their true proportion

when it is realized that the two main types of Consecration Prayer, Eastern and Western, are already firmly established in the Anglican Communion. But the problem is larger than that. We need to recognize that there are among Christian worshippers two different types of temperament to be regarded. We may distinguish them as tending respectively, to use Professor Pratt's terms, towards "objective" or "subjective" worship; as of a sacramental or non-sacramental cast; even within the Eucharist itself as inclined to emphasize the God-ward or the man-ward side of the action. The Roman Church has concentrated predominantly on providing for temperaments of the first of these two types in its public worship: Anglicanism quite definitely recognizes the existence of both. It means that we are at a certain practical disadvantage in face of the Roman claim that when a Roman Catholic goes to church on Sunday he will always find the same service. The true reply is to say frankly, first, that the Anglican Communion aims at providing both types of worship; and, secondly, that therefore every worshipper ought to be, not only tolerant of, but thoroughly instructed in each of them.

It is with the community that is charged with this vision of God and nourished by His supernatural life through its union with Christ in the Spirit that the remaining sections of the Agenda are concerned. That first section, then, is bound to be their rubric. And, if it is so, we need not fear for the handling of the subjects that follow. The nature of the problems to be discussed in the second section betrays a clear consciousness of the Church's sociological functions. For these problems are not those of any one nation or state; they are part and parcel of the Church's life amidst modern civilization. The assembled bishops are to be spokesmen here, not only of Christ, but of Christendom; for nothing less than the conception of Christendom or the City of God can stand firm today amid the mighty forces that tend to disintegrate the Christian life. The principles underlying this conception are powerfully brought out in Mr. Christopher Dawson's *Progress and Religion*.* After touching upon the material factors of any culture, such as place, occupation, and people, he claims that the chief *differentia* of cultures, and the main instrument in their change, lies in the spiritual sphere. Modern secularism is abnormal and transitory, and is largely due to the blindness of eighteenth and nineteenth century thought to the sociological function of religion; and the determinism which so often went with it left no place for pro-

* Sheed and Ward. 1929. 10s. 6d. net.

gress. Christianity, on the other hand, is inevitably progressive; for it rests upon the Incarnation, which is the introduction of a new vital principle into humanity, and initiates a new movement of progress towards the "deification" of man. And what is needed today is that the Church should reassert in unambiguous terms the traditions of the older culture against the dominance of the machine, which is so marked a feature of contemporary civilization in Russia and in North America.*

Each one of the sub-headings of Section II. of the Agenda raises issues of fundamental sociological importance at the present day. What is at stake is nothing less than the life of the race. Monogamous marriage and the idea of the family as the primary unity of society are not inventions of Christianity; but Christianity has put the whole weight of its authority behind them, says that they are divine gifts of nature, and proceeds to sanctify and bless them. Today both these institutions are the subject of vigorous attack, the first from a philosophy which can find no meaning in the word "fidelity," the second from a form of political theory which regards the life of all individuals as the property of the absolute State. The extreme individualism of Mr. Bertrand Russell thus makes common cause with the extreme communism of Lenin. And the cockpit of the struggle lies in education. The two absolutisms, of the individual and of the State, reckon to seize upon the child's impressionable years for the inculcation of their principles. The Church, on the other hand, insists that throughout those years the religious tradition of the family must be maintained as part and parcel of the child's education. Amid the forces of race-destruction, which if unchecked must involve civilization in ruins, Catholicism stands out as the *tertium genus*, the new race, the Israel of God, which has the future before it. There, and there only, are the principles of monogamy, of the family, and of religious education secure. The Lambeth Conference offers a great opportunity for vindicating them afresh.

Section III. of the Agenda deals with the Unity of the Church. We deprecate very strongly, as our readers know, the language of crisis which has been so freely used in this connection. If we are right in believing that the first section of the Lambeth Agenda will be found to strike the keynote of the whole, we can be certain that the organic unity which we already have in our Communion with the Church of all the ages will not

* See also Mr. Dawson's *Christianity and Sex*. Faber and Faber. Criterion Miscellany series. 1s. net.

be jeopardized. The Bishops, as they assemble in July, will be more and not less conscious, in view of the present needs of Christendom, of what the fourth element in the Lambeth Quadrilateral stands for. For the episcopate is the direct successor of the apostolate, and the apostolate was the visible representative of the risen and ascended Messiah. The episcopate, that is to say, is the permanent witness to the Incarnation as historic fact. "Ministerial parity," the theory on which the Nonconformist position rests, is a principle not merely unknown to the New Testament, but inconsistent with it; and the same is true of any papal claims that go beyond a primacy, or tend to derogate from the apostolic authority of the Bishops. There have been changes, no doubt, at different times in the place where the emphasis was laid on the doctrine of apostolic succession: at one time it was laid on succession in the faith, at another on sacramental succession. But it would be untrue to say that there has ever been a time when the episcopate has been an institution divorced from any doctrine as to its supernatural vocation in the Church. Such an institution could never have played the part in history that the episcopate has done;* and its acceptance on such a basis would be something less than honest.

So far as South India is concerned, we have little to add to what we wrote in these pages last November.† An important event since then has been the discussion of the South India scheme by the General Council of the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon, and by the Indian Episcopal Synod, and their findings upon it. These findings are marked by a charity, a fidelity, and a patient hopefulness such as befit a great province of the Catholic Church; and the questions referred to Lambeth are detailed and significant. [They will be the subject of an article in THEOLOGY next month.] Meanwhile, anxieties have undoubtedly been allayed, now that it is seen that precipitate counsels have not prevailed, and that the *Proposals* are still open to discussion and modification.

The Unity of the Church, however, is a subject larger than any of the specific reports or proposals that will occupy the Conference: indeed, it is not so much a subject as a faith and a vision. For it rests upon, and derives from, the unity of the

* We hope to publish an article on the subject next month from the pen of Professor Whitney.

† One correction must be made. Owing to a *lapsus oculi* in reading (and re-reading) the form of liturgy contained in the S. Indian *Proposals*, we missed the heading, "The Thanksgiving," and so were not satisfied that a Prayer of Consecration was expressly provided. We are glad of this opportunity of correcting the mistake.

one God and Father of all; belongs to the one faith, one Lord, and baptism of our Christian profession; and is the correlative of the one Spirit. Christians are divided, but we cannot think of the Bride of Christ as divided, and it is her unity in Him that needs first and foremost to be made plain. The ideal and future of the Anglican Communion is not to continue in isolation from other Communions, but rather to die to live in Christ's reunited Body, so only that its characteristic temper and traditions of thought be integrated with the whole. For, like Rome and like the Church of the East, it is an interpretation of the whole; thankful for the faith and sensitive to the sufferings of its fellow-members, as its continuous record in relation to the Russian Church makes plain; aware, as the Malines conversations intimate, of the deep spiritual bonds that unite it with the Church of the West; eager to help build into the life of the one Body the several contributions of Nonconformity. Such a vision of the Church, standing firm in the truth of the Gospel, joined to Christ by the life-giving power of His sacraments, inspired by His Spirit and served by a ministry whose every part is in organic relationship to the rest, will not fail to evoke vocations to the priesthood or to enlist the generosity of youth. For it will manifest the Church not as one society among others, but as the divine community in which all other social organisms find their fulfilment; the embodiment of the Kingdom of Heaven on earth; after Christ Himself, God's greatest gift to the world. *Oremus.*

ISRAEL AND MOAB—II

THE first time we hear of contact between Israel in Palestine and Moab, their relations are hostile. The episode of Eglon and Ehud (Judg. iii. 12-30) is sadly significant of what the future relations of these peoples were to be—a chronicle of never-ending hostility and mutual hatred. The narrative is old and authentic. It is well known that the section Judg. ii. 6 to xvi. 31, which may be called the real book of Judges, is composed of two entirely different elements—viz., early contemporary songs and narratives relating to the achievements of individual judges, and a frame or chronological religious scheme in which an editor has inserted these songs and narratives.* This is one of the narratives, and was probably composed not very long after the happening of the events described. It contains some words which occur nowhere else and of which the meaning can only be conjectured.† Like other stories of this series, it does not and cannot refer to a tyranny exercised over the whole nation, for such a united nation did not exist. It was a local and partial invasion of the district most accessible to Moab—the Palm city, Jericho (Judg. i. 16; Deut. xxxiv. 5), and the district round it, some parts of Benjamin and Ephraim. It is true that Jericho as a fortress had been destroyed (Josh. vi. 24), and was first restored by Chiel of Bethel (1 Kings xvi. 34), but in the interim the place could be dwelt in as an open town (2 Sam. x. 5).‡ It has been supposed that the King of Moab resided in Jericho, but this is not stated in the text and is in itself unlikely.§ It may be that he had a country house in the subject district, where he came for short periods to receive the tribute.

The name of the King, Eglon, is of interest as having no resemblance to any other Moabite royal name known to us. We have Chemoshmelek (or Chemoshkan) and his son Mesha,‖ and Balak and Chemoshnadab¶ and Salmanu** (see Hos. x. 14), but Eglon, calf-man, is curious. It does not seem to contain any

* See Wellhausen, Comp. iii. 211*f.*; Kittel, Gesch. II. ii. 47; Burney, Jud. xxxv.*f.*

† גֹּמֶד (verse 16), LXX *σπιθαμῆς*, Lat. *palmæ manus*, some measure of length. פַּרְשְׁדוֹנָה (verse 22), LXX *τὴν προστάδα*, Aq. *παραστάδα*. Σ *εἰς τὰ πρόθυρα*, Lat. *ostiis*. מִסְדְּרוֹנָה (verse 23), LXX *τοῦς διατεταγμένους*, Lat. *per posticum* (Burney conj. *porticum*). May these be Moabite words? נָצָב (verse 22) is nowhere else used in this sense.

‡ Oettli, Com. Jud., p. 231.

§ Maspero, *u.s.*, ii. 685, n. 3. In verse 13, for וַיִּירַשׁ should be read וַיִּירָשׁ, with LXX *ἐκληρονόμησε*, Lat. *possedit*.

‖ Mesha, l. 1; see Driver, Sam. lxxxvi; Burney, Jud., 316.

¶ Schrader, K.A.T. ii. 291.

** *Ibid.*, 258, 440.

reference to a god. With some hesitation we suggest the following view: The broken letters in lines 17-18 of the Mesha-stone have been variously restored as אתכלי or אראלי.* It has, however, been proposed to restore את-עגלי, "calves of,"† which recalls to us the calf worship of Aaron and of Jeroboam. If we could suppose the existence of a similar cult in Moab, the name of Eglon might well contain an allusion to the god worshipped in the form of a calf. It is a striking fact that Chemosh, the god who is so prominent in Hebrew and Moabite records, is not mentioned in this narrative at all.

The statement that Ehud was left-handed‡ reminds us of the 700 men of Benjamin (Judg. xx. 16), who are similarly described. It would be interesting to know whether this was a peculiarity of the tribe or an acquired habit useful to slingers in battle. Whichever it was, it was certainly favourable to schemes like Ehud's.

The statement that porters were required to carry the tribute suggests that it was paid in kind. Mesha, before his revolt, paid to the King of Israel a large tribute in wool and lambs (2 Kings iii. 4),§ and we may conclude that in these primitive times the tribute to Eglon would similarly be in some form of farm produce.

The Gilgal mentioned in this narrative would be the stone circle traditionally ascribed to Joshua (Josh. iv. 3, 19, 20), about three miles south-east of Jericho and about the same distance from the Jordan. This position is quite suitable to the story, and there is no reason to prefer another Gilgal on the boundary between Judah and Benjamin (Josh. xv. 7, xviii. 17).‖

Such circles of stone or *cromlechs* have been found in considerable numbers (it is said 700) in Moab and other countries to the east of the Jordan.¶ It is probable that at every place called Gilgal there was a rude stone circle of this kind, the centre of some primitive cult, as at the stone or *menhir* of Bethel (Gen. xxviii. 18).** Very probably the Israelites had learnt the use of such circles and the religious rites practised at them during their sojourn in Moab. The heathen usages at the Gilgal were denounced at a later time by Hosea (xii. 12). But in this narrative

* Driver, xci.

† By Clermont Ganneau. I owe this reference to the kindness of Prof. A. A. Bevan. Comp. עגלת (Isa. xv. 5; Jer. xlviii. 34) and עין עגלים (Ezek. xlvii. 10).

‡ יטר יד ימינו does not mean, with LXX, ἀμφοτεροδέξιον or ἀμφιδέξιον (so Lat.), the proper Hebrew for which is found in 1 Chron. xii. 2, but "restrained in the right hand." Oettli, p. 232; Burney, p. 70.

§ Burney, Kings, 268.

‖ Meyer, *u.s.*, p. 473. There was a Gilgal near Jaffa (Josh. xii. 23) and perhaps one at Shechem (Deut. xi. 30). See Driver, Deut., p. 133.

¶ Maspero, *op. cit.*, ii. 165 and plate; Conder, Palestine, 143-145.

** See Driver, Gen., p. 67.

there is a significant addition to the stone circle, "the carved images which were at the Gilgal"* (verses 19, 28). It is interesting to consider whether these were Israelite or Moabite, and we think the narrative indicates the latter, though they seem to have stood on the soil of Benjamin. Ehud and his porters seem to have reached the idols on their way home. He dismisses them and returns to the King, to whom he says, "I have a secret communication to thee, O King." The King calls "silence" and dismisses his retinue. When Ehud repeats that he has a word from God, the King stands up in reverence to hear it. All this shows that the idols and the circle were a place where oracles were pronounced in the name of some god whom the King of Moab respected, and this must have been a Moabite divinity.

Ehud, after the murder, escaped apparently to some place in Mount Ephraim, roused the people and led† them to the fords of Jordan. He succeeded in cutting off and destroying the Moabite garrison and freeing the land.

There appears to be hidden under the present text of Judges another allusion to hostilities between Israel and Moab. In xi. 12-28 is contained an account of speeches made by Jephtha to the *Ammonites*, but nearly every word of them reads as if it was addressed to the Moabites, and if one name be substituted for the other in x. 17, xi. 12, 13, 14, 27, 28, this becomes quite clear. Thus the complaint in verses 13-14. "Israel took *my* land from the Arnon to the Jabbok" exactly describes the *Moabite* territory which was conquered by Sihon. Jephtha replies (verse 17) that Israel had requested a friendly passage *through Moab* (a fact not named in Numbers or Deuteronomy) and how, this being refused, Israel went round the land of *Moab* and encamped across Arnon and did not enter the boundary of *Moab*, for Arnon is the boundary of *Moab*. He argues: "Those that Chemosh *thy* god drives out, them thou wilt possess." But Chemosh is the god of *Moab*. He alludes to the fact that Balak, King of *Moab*, did not make war upon Israel. He points to Israel's long possession of Heshbon, Aroer, and the cities on the Arnon, all in *Moab*. And when hostilities followed, he drove the enemy from Aroer to Minnith‡ (near Heshbon) and captured twenty cities. There can be little doubt that this piece originally related to Moab, and was afterwards fitted into the story about Ammon, nor is there anything unlikely in the story of a Moabite invasion of Israelite territory at this or any other time. This piece is clearly

* The rendering "quarries" in A.V. is not correct. The word פסילים, LXX τὰ γλυπτὰ, Lat. *idola*. Syr. as Hebrew, occurs twenty-one times, and always denotes "carved images." Burney, Jud. 71; Meyer, *u.s.*

† In verse 28 for רדפו read רְדוּ; LXX κατάβητε ὀπίσω μου.

‡ Nunc autem ostenditur *Mannith* villa in quarto lapide Esbus pergentibus Filadelfiam. Lagarde, Onom. 171, 276.

an interpolation where it stands, with some editorial matter, but it is difficult to see where it came from or why it was inserted in this place. According to one view, its origin is as late as the Exile, when the whole of the old Moabite territory north of the Arnon, formerly occupied by the tribe of Gad, had been appropriated by the Ammonites and their god Milcom (Jer. xlix. 1; see Amos i. 13; Ezek. xxv. 2), so that this passage was written mainly with the aid of Num. xx. and xxi. as a protest against this occupation, and inserted in its present place.* We do not find this theory convincing. The facts we have pointed out as to these speeches being obviously directed against Moab, especially the allusions to Chemosh "thy god" and Balak, would never have been inserted in an address to Ammon. Where is Milcom, the well-known god of Ammon (1 Kings xi. 5; Zeph. i. 5), who is expressly referred to by Jeremiah in the passage on which this theory is based? Surely if this address had been designed to impress the Ammonites or anybody else it would have contained topics relevant to them, and not have been all about the Moabites. And it has been observed that the passage in which Chemosh is treated as a god of the same tribal authority as Jahveh is quite alien to late prophetic theology.

Another view is that the object of these speeches was to show the lawfulness of the title of Israel to these territories through conquest and long possession against any claimant, whoever he was. If the Moabites had no title, how much less had the Ammonites!† The difficulty about this view is, as before, that in an address to Ammon the allusion to "Chemosh thy god" is simply impossible.

Kittel‡ brings this episode into the narrative in this way: After the defeat of Ammon and of Ephraim, Jephtha was resident in Mizpeh as a tribal head and Kadi. His position excited the Moabites, who laid claim to all the territory south of the Jabbok. A new war on Moabite ground took place, in which he was victorious, and there followed the fulfilment of his vow (xi. 34-40). This view is quite tenable. The position of the episode and the alteration of Moabite to Ammonite may be ascribed to later editors.

Burney,§ after a careful review of the whole matter, concludes that there were originally two traditions, a Moabite and an Ammonite. In the Moabite tradition‖ Jephtha is a leading citizen ofMizpeh who assembles the armies of Israel there

* Wellhausen, Comp. iii. 221; Meyer, *u.s.*, 533.

† Oettli, Com., p. 270. ‡ Gesch., II. ii, p. 99. § Judges, 295 *f.*

‖ Comprising x. 17, xi. 12-28, 31, 33 part. This source is ascribed to E. In xi. 20, for האמין should be read וַיִּתְּמָן, with LXX καὶ οὐκ ἠθέλησε, and Syr. The Lat. is curious: *Que et ipse Israel verba despiciens non dimisit eum transire per terminos eos.*

to repel the Moabite invasion. He tries diplomacy in vain, and makes his well-known vow. The Moabites are defeated. Jephtha returns to Mizpeh and fulfils his vow. A later editor has altered "Moabites" to "children of Ammon," to bring this story into line with the Ammonite story of J. The writer does not propose to offer a decision on this difficult literary question. The solutions of Kittel and of Burney agree in a result sufficient for our present purpose—namely, that there was in the period of Jephtha a serious attack by Moab on Israel and that it was defeated, and it would seem that the invaders were driven back to their old boundary on the Arnon.

It should not, however, be supposed that in this period the relations between the two contiguous peoples were continuous warfare. For we have fortunately preserved to us in the book of *Ruth* a picture which may help us to realize the normal relations between the two in long periods of peaceful intercourse. In consequence of famine a man of Bethlehem, with his wife and two sons, went to Moab and remained there. He died there and his sons both took Moabite wives. After ten years both sons died, and one of these wives and her mother-in-law returned to Bethlehem. It is not suggested that there was anything unusual or unlikely about this double migration or about the long residence of these Judeans in Moab. It is even more striking that as Ruth crosses the border between the two countries she feels that in passing from Moab to Judah she was leaving the land of Chemosh to enter that of Jahveh and felt no difficulty about it. "Thy God shall be my God," and she was freely received into the community of Jahveh, the God of Israel (Ruth ii. 12).* The similarity of language and religious conceptions, as well as the geographical position of the two countries, make these facts of migration and intermarriage possible and intelligible.

There is a late but probable tradition that David had a Moabite ancestry (Ruth iv. 22; 1 Chron. ii. 15), and this would seem to be confirmed by the fact that when in trouble he went to Mizpeh in Moab (perhaps Zophim, Num. xxiii. 14) to ask for an asylum for his father and mother and left them there (1 Sam. xxii. 3). This may have been the cause of Saul's hostility to Moab (1 Sam. xiv. 47), of which we have no details. In view of these circumstances, and noting the fact that David actually numbered a Moabite among his *gibborim* (1 Chron. xi. 26, 46), we find some difficulty in understanding David's war with Moab, his atrocious cruelty to them, and his reducing them to a tributary people (2 Sam. viii. 1, 2). There is a curious fragment (Ps. lx. 8-12; Ps. cviii. 8-12) which seems to date from Davidic

* See Cannon, "The Book of Ruth," THEOLOGY, June 1928, p. 313.

times. It certainly contains no detail unsuited to that period.* In verse 11 Moab, Edom, and Philistia are viewed as subject peoples. "Moab is my wash pot," etc. Does this suggest that there had been a confederation of these three peoples against David which led to bloody reprisals? The Moabites were themselves savage enough in warfare (2 Kings iii. 27; Hos. x. 14; Amos ii. 1),† and perhaps, as often happens, one act of ferocity led to another. No doubt there were frequent conflicts between Moab and Gad to keep up the spirit of hostility and revenge.

Quite another scene presents itself in the time of Solomon. Among the inmates of his extensive harem were included Moabite women, and at their instigation he not only built a *Bamah* to Chemosh, the god of Moab, but apparently in person‡ he burnt incense and offered sacrifices to this and other foreign gods (1 Kings xi. 1-8). Thus the sanctuary to Jahveh in Moab§ had a counterpart in the sanctuary of Chemosh in Israel. It is easy to understand that if Moabites came to Jerusalem for any purpose they would gladly avail themselves of this opportunity of sacrificing at the altar of their own god.‖ This view seems to explain the fact that this sanctuary maintained its existence long after Moab was independent of Israel and until it was destroyed by Josiah (2 Kings xxiii. 13, 14).

On the division of Israel into two kingdoms all the Transjordanic tribes fell to the Northern Kingdom (1 Kings xi. 31), Reuben being by this time politically extinct.

For the time which followed we have the invaluable help of a contemporary inscription, the *stele* of Mesha,¶ discovered at Dibon, four miles north of the Arnon.** This record enables us to fill up the somewhat meagre outlines in 2 Kings. Mesha was the son and successor of Chemoshmelek or Chemosh-kan, who reigned thirty years (ll. 1, 2). The latter is called "the Dibonite," which shows that Moab in his time had crossed the Arnon into Israelite territory. Apparently they even held Madeba nearly as far north as Heshbon†† (ll. 7, 8). This aggressor had been put down by Omri, who afflicted Moab for many days and recovered Madeba and held it during his days (twelve years) and half the days of his son (ll. 4-8). This last expression raises a

* See Ewald, Psalmen, iii., p. 42. In verse 11 we read with Ps. cviii. אֶתְרוֹעָע. It is curious that verse 8 uses the Piel of מרד in the same way as 2 Sam. viii. 2.

† See Mesha, ll. 11, 16.

‡ Reading with Luc. in verse 8 מַקְטִיר and מְזַבֵּחַ. Burney, Kings, p. 155.

§ Mesha, ll. 17-18.

‖ See Kittel, Gesch. II. ii, 230.

¶ The text of the inscription with translation and notes is given in Driver, Sam. lxxxv. *f.* A translation with notes by S. A. Cook will be found in Cam. Anc. Hist. iii. 372.

** Villa per grandis juxta Arnonem. Lagarde, Onom. 148, 257.

†† Madeba is mentioned in the song about Sihon (Num. xxi. 30): Usque hodie urbs Arabiæ antiquum nomen retinens juxta Esebon. *Ibid.*, 170.

difficulty. It is stated (2 Kings i. 1 and iii. 5) that Moab revolted after the death, not during the life, of Ahab. The latter is not named on the stone. Some writers* translate the word (בנה) "his sons," which would include Ahab, Ahaziah, and Jehoram, and thus reconcile the two authorities, or it may be that the Moabite scribe did not know who was King of Israel at the time of their revolt. The completeness of Omri's subjugation of Moab appears from the heavy tribute paid. Moab was a country of sheep-farming,† and the tribute consisted of 100,000 lambs and the wool of 100,000 rams (2 Kings iii. 4; comp. Isa. xvi. 1). In the time, it seems, of Ahaziah Moab threw off this yoke (ll. 8, 9; 2 Kings iii. 5). Mesha describes his battles and sieges in vivid terms. The men of Gad had dwelt in the land of Ataroth from of old—probably as an *enclave* with Moab around.‡ Mesha took the city, slew all the people, and carried away the altar-hearth of Davdoh (ll. 10-13).§ Next he made a night attack on Nebo (where we remember there was a sanctuary of Jahveh), fought against it from dawn to noon, took it and slew 7,000 men besides women and maids, and carried off its *sacra* (ll. 14-18). Then with only 200 men he took Jahaz (l. 20). Evidently the resistance was over. Never again, as far as we know, did Moab pay tribute to Israel.

It will be interesting to note how many of the towns mentioned by Mesha are found in the lists of those assigned by Israelite tradition to Reuben and Gad.

Mesha.	*Num. xxxii.* 34 *f.*	*Josh. xiii.* 15 *f.*
Dibon (ll. 1, 2, 21, 28).	*Ibid.*, verse 34.	*Ibid.*, verse 17.
Madeba (ll. 8, 30).	—	*Ibid.*, verse 17.
Baal Meon (l. 9).	*Ibid.*, verse 37.	—
Kiriathaim (l. 10).	*Ibid.*, verse 37.	*Ibid.*, verse 19.
Ataroth (ll. 10, 11).	*Ibid.*, verse 34.	—
Nebo (l. 14).	*Ibid.*, verse 38.	—
Iahaz (l. 14).	—	*Ibid.*, verse 17.
Aroer (l. 26).	*Ibid.*, verse 34.	*Ibid.*, verses 16, 25.
Beth Baal Meon (l. 30).	—	*Ibid.*, verse 17.

This comparison tends to show that the statements in Num. xxxii., although of a somewhat late origin, are based on a sound historical tradition. It was observed by Driver that all the places named on the stone, except Choronaim (l. 32), are in the disputed territory north of the Arnon.

But Mesha was more than a warrior; he was a great constructor. He rebuilt many towns (ll. 9, 21, 26, 27, 29, 30),

* Cook, *u.s.*; Kittel, Gesch. II. ii, 340, n. 5.

† Mesha, like Amos (i. 1), was a נֹקֵד, an owner of sheep. Sellin, Zwölfprophetenbuch, 160.

‡ Kittel, *l.c.*

§ את־אראלדודה. For the altar-hearth see Ezek. xliii. 15. *Davdoh* was clearly a divinity. Can the name be in any way connected with David?

built a palace (l. 23), constructed walls, gates, towers, reservoirs and cisterns (ll. 21, 23, 24, 25), and highways (l. 26). Under his vigorous rule independent Moab must have been quite as far, if not more, advanced in culture and the arts of life as the Kingdoms of Israel.

With regard to religious conceptions the two nations seem to have been on much the same level. The expressions applied to Chemosh on the stone are strangely like those applied to Jahveh in Israelite sources.

"Chemosh, let me see my pleasure on all them that hated me."* See Ps. cxviii. 17.

"Chemosh was angry with his land."† See 2 Kings xvii. 18.

"The King dragged (Israelite sacra) before Chemosh."‡ See 2 Sam. xvii. 13; 1 Sam. xv. 33.

"A gazing stock."§ See Nah. iii. 6.

"To Ashtor-Chemosh I devoted it."‖ See Deut. ii. 34.

"Chemosh drove him out."¶ See Josh. xxiv. 18.

These specimens are enough to show not only identity of language, but similarity of thought. What Jahveh was to Israel—the national God—such exactly was Chemosh to Moab (Judg. xi. 24).

Jehoram, the successor of Ahaziah, was not disposed to lose this Moabite territory without a struggle. He obtained the alliance of Jehoshaphat, King of Judah, and his vassal, the prefect-King of Edom (1 Kings xxii. 48). The allies did not, as might have been expected, enter the disputed land north of the Arnon, probably because the towns had been fortified by Mesha,** but they went round the Dead Sea and through Edom to attack Moab from the south. After much suffering from want of water they reached the boundary, where they found drawn up the whole strength of Moab. The allies were victorious, and pursued the Moabites and ravaged the land until the enemy was driven to his last refuge in Kir Chareset (2 Kings iii. 25), otherwise Kir Moab (Isa. xv. 1, xvi. 11; Jer. xlviii. 31, 36), called Καρακὰ (2 Mac. xii. 17), now *Kerak*, a town with fortifications upon cliffs, forming so completely one mass with the rock that Ibrahim Pasha in 1834 was obliged to give up the intention of destroying it.†† Mesha was in despair. Chemosh was angry with his land—a desperate effort must be made to win his favour. So the King took his son and heir and offered him as a burnt sacrifice upon the city wall. Unhappily we have no Moabite chronicler to explain to us what happened next, but we learn

* הראני בכל שנאי (l. 4). † יאנף . . . בארצה (l. 5).
‡ ואסהבם לפני כמש (l. 18); אסהבה לפני כמש (l. 12).
§ ריח (l. 12). ‖ החרמתה (l. 17). ¶ וינרשה כמש (l. 19).
** Maspero, *op. cit.*, iii. 80; Kittel, Gesch. II. ii, 362.
†† Delitzsch, Isaiah, E.T. i, 289.

that there was great fury against Israel. The latter dared not face at once the maddened enemy and the appeased god of the land—and perhaps also the doubtful fidelity of their Edomite ally (2 Kings iii. 26). They turned and retreated, leaving Moab in possession of the complete territory. From this, at a somewhat later time (that of Joash), their marauding bands used to raid Israel every spring (2 Kings xiii. 20). An example of these raids at a still later time is mentioned when "Shalman wasted Beth-Arbel in the battle day—mothers and children were dashed to pieces" (Hos. x. 14). Shalman was Salamanu, a Moabite King who paid tribute to Tiglath Pileser,* and Beth-Arbel seems to have been across the Jordan near Pella,† a very likely place for a Moabite raid. We have mentioned this episode a little out of its place, for before this time Moab had received a violent blow. The two usurpers, Hazael and Jehu, who had ascended the throne together, became bitter foes,‡ and Jehu lost his territory beyond the Jordan. "Jahveh began to loathe§ Israel, and Hazael smote them in all the boundary of Israel from the Jordan eastward . . . the Gadites, and the Reubenites, and the Manassites, from Aroer, which is on the Wady of Arnon, to Gilead and Bashan" (2 Kings x. 32). So the debatable land north of the Arnon was for a short time dominated by the *Syrians*.

But not for long. The great Jeroboam II. beat back the Syrians and restored the boundary of Israel (2 Kings xiv. 25; Amos vi. 14). A prophetic oracle describes in vivid terms his reconquest of Moab. This oracle is contained in Isa. xv. to xvi. 12, but it is generally held not to be the work of Isaiah, but of an anonymous and much earlier prophet—perhaps the oldest extant specimen of written prophecy. The reasons for this view are shortly as follows:‖

(*a*) The express statement in xvi. 13. "This is the word which Jahveh spoke about Moab some time ago."

(*b*) The sympathetic tone in which the author speaks of Moab, which is quite different from the general tone of later prophets (Amos ii. 1-3; Jer. xlviii. 40 *f.*; Ezek. xxv. 8 *f.*).

(*c*) The author's evident personal knowledge of the topography of Moab, whereas Isaiah was a city man.

(*d*) The very eulogistic description of the Judean King (xvi. 5), which would apply very well to Azariah-Uzziah (2 Chron.

* Schrader, K.A.T. ii. 441. Sellin proposed to read *Shallum* (2 Kings xv. 10), *u.s.*, p. 85, but not very happily. A foreign raider seems more suitable than a native King.

† Et est usque hodie vicus Arbel trans Jordanem in finibus Pellæ. Lagarde, Onom. 123, 236.

‡ Cam. Anc. Hist. iii. 374.

§ Reading לָקוּץ with Lat. *tædere*.

‖ See Ewald, Propheten, E.T. ii. 137 *f.*; Driver, Int. i. 203; Maspero, Hist. Anc. iii. 124, n. 3; Cheyne, Isaiah, iv. 93, 301; Peake, Com. 448.

xxvi. 1-10). We therefore consider this oracle to be a contemporary account of the conquest of Moab by Jeroboam in the days of Uzziah (2 Kings xv. 1), written by a prophet of Judah who was perhaps an eye-witness of the events he describes. This oracle has many features of interest.*

1. The conquest of the country must have been very thorough. Not only do we find the well-known names north of the Arnon: Dibon (also named Dimon, *sc.* Blood-town, xv. 9), Madeba, Nebo, Heshbon, Elaelah, Jahaz, Nimrim, Jazer, mostly named by Mesha; but towns south of the Arnon, as Kir Moab (or Kir Chareset) and Ar Moab, both destroyed in a night; Zoar and Choronaim. The whole of Moab was occupied and devastated and her soldiers went about trembling(xv. 4).

2. Consternation and outcry were everywhere. The narrator must have seen the people clothed in sackcloth with cut hair and beards on the streets, the roofs, the squares, howling and weeping. Some go to the *Bamoth* and temples to pray—in vain. Moab is ashamed of Chemosh (Jer. xlviii. 13). Fruit trees and vineyards are ruined; there is no joyful vintage cry of *Hedad*† (Jer. xxv. 30). Wells are stopped; the land is dried up, without verdure. Many flee before the invading hosts. We see the groups of terrified women like fluttering birds crossing the fords of Arnon (xvi. 2). At last the fugitives reach Zoar (Gen. xix. 22), the southern boundary of the land, carrying with them the property they have been able to save. They ascend with weeping the pass of Luchith,‡ descend the declivity of Choronaim (Jer. xlviii. 5), cross the Valley of Willows (perhaps the Wady Zered, Num. xxi. 11), and arrive at Beer-Elim or Beerah (Num. xxi. 16).§ At last they are safe in Edom and assemble at Sela (Petra).‖

3. The prophet now urges these refugees¶ to place themselves under the protection of Judah and its King, and send the tribute-lambs there (2 Kings iii. 4), to ask his counsel and to take refuge

* Parts of this oracle are quoted in Jer. xlviii. 4, 5, 29-38. The quotation is too free to help much in criticism of the text. The following readings, however, are worthy of attention:

Verse 29: נאה; Isa. xvi. 6: נא.

גבהו; גאותו. Isa. xvi. 6.

Verse 31: Verbs in first person; Isa. xvi. 7 in third person.

Ins. אזעק om.; מואב.

Verse 32: בצירך; xvi. 9: קצירך.

הדד; שׂרד.

Verse 34: After צער ins. עד־חרנים; Isa. xvi. 5 deest.

Verse 5: מרד חרונים; Isa. xv. 5: דרך ה.

† See Delitzsch, Isaiah, E.T. i. 302.

‡ Est hodie vicus inter Areopolim et Zoaram nomine *Luitha*. Lagarde, Onom. 168, 273.

§ As to these localities, see Delitzsch, *op. cit.*, 295.

‖ These names denote the same place. Meyer, *op. cit.*, p. 357.

¶ Reading with Ewald in verse 4, נָדַחַי.

under his shadow. The description of Judah is very remarkable:

"At an end is the extortioner, finished is destruction, consumed out of the land are tramplers. And a throne is established through kindness, and one sits thereon in faithfulness in the tent of David, judging and seeking justice and prompt in righteousness" (xvi. 4, 5).

If this refers to Uzziah and is written by a contemporary, it strongly confirms the account in 2 Chron. xxvi., which is really all we know of that King. No doubt is expressed as to the ability of the King of Judah to protect Moab from its invaders, and in fact the neighbouring kingdom of Ammon was paying tribute to him (2 Chron. xxvi. 8).

4. But it was not to be. Moab was too proud to accept succour from Judah. Pride was the deepest trait in the Moabite character (Isa. xxv. 11, Mesha, *passim*). In this oracle the words are heaped together: pride, haughtiness, pride, fury, lying babble. The aid offered is not accepted, so Moab goes on howling for Moab (xvi. 7). The prophet mourns in vain over her sad plight (xvi. 11).

We have not the end of this story, but it seems likely that this Israelite occupation of Moab did not last long, perhaps not even for the lifetime of Jeroboam. For at a later date Amos (ii. 1-3) uttered an oracle in a very different tone from that of the older prophet. Although Jeroboam is still living, there is no hint of Israelite sovereignty over Moab nor any strain of pity. Moab has palaces, and judges, and princes, and an army, and her predicted doom is yet in the future. What the outrage was which called forth this burst of indignation we do not know. Perhaps in the war with the allied Kings (2 Kings iii.) the Edomite royal graves had been violated.* But it is an illustration of the insolent ferocity (עברה) of Moab, which was alluded to as a national trait (Isa. xvi. 6; Jer. xlviii. 30).

Moab, although independent of both Israel and Judah, was on at least two occasions allied with one or other of them against the Assyrian power. Such were (*a*) the conspiracy of Menachem against Tiglath Pileser (2 Kings xix. 15 *f.*),† where Salmanu, King of Moab, is mentioned as bringing tribute. (*b*) The conspiracy of Hezekiah against Sargon (2 Kings xviii. 7; Isa. xx. 1),‡ where Chemosh-nadab, King of Moab, is mentioned in the same way as bringing tribute. It is not unlikely§ that

* Orelli, Die Zwölf. Kl. Proph. 66. In verse 3 Nowack (Die Kl. Proph. iii. 125) and Sellin (*u.s.* 16) propose to read קִיר מוֹאָב (Isa. xv. 1) for הקריות (Jer. xlviii. 23; Mesha, l. 13). This is very attractive, but there is no evidence for it.

† Schrader, K.A.T. ii. 258; Cam. Anc. Hist. iii. 37, 282.

‡ Schrader, *ibid.*, 291; Cam. Anc. Hist. iii. 58, 388.

§ Peake, Comm., p. 448.

at the time of this latter event Isaiah, dissatisfied with the conduct of this ally, published the old prophecy about Moab and added an epilogue announcing her speedy ruin (Isa. xvi. 13). But this ruin was not to come so soon. When Sennacherib burst into Judah ten years later, Chemosh-nadab, by timely submission and by rich gifts and heavy tribute, averted the storm.*

These alliances do not seem to have made Moab less insolent or the feelings of Judah less bitter. In the reign of Josiah, and probably early in that reign,† Moab and Ammon are accused of the old offences—pride and reproachful talk—with a worse crime—violation of Judah's sacred territory.‡ So, says the prophet, Moab shall be as Sodom (whose fate she had once escaped), the remnant of my people shall spoil them, and the remainder of my nation shall inherit them, and Jahveh will make lean all the gods of the earth (Zeph. ii. 8-11).

A similar feeling is displayed in Deuteronomy. "Ammonite and Moabite shall not come into Jahveh's assembly, even to the tenth generation; he shall never come into Jahveh's assembly. . . . Thou shalt not seek their peace or their prosperity all thy days for ever" (Deut. xxiii. 4-7). We do not think that the old happenings at the time of the Exodus, which are referred to, had much to do with this enactment. The prophets reveal to us how deep-seated was the feeling of hatred which prompted it.

The long oracle against Moab in Jer. xlviii. is largely based on and expanded from the old prophecy in Isa. xv. to xvi. and from poems in Numbers (xxi. 28, 29, xxiv. 17). There seems no reason to doubt that Jeremiah was the author, even if there has been a little later editing.§ It seems to date from the fourth year of Jehoiakim, when marauding bands from Moab joined the Chaldean invader (2 Kings xxiv. 3). The topics and treatment are very like those of the older oracle. The invader comes from the north—Heshbon (verses 23, 45).‖ Everyone is fleeing south with howls and cries of ruin; the long list of ruined cities contains the old familiar names (verse 21 *f.*). We see the fugitives at Aroer and the Arnon, and follow them in their sorrowful journey to Zoar (verses 3,¶ 5, 34). Vineyards, fruit, and wine are all perished (verse 32 *f.*). The pride, fury, and boastful talk of Moab are again described (verse 29). Vain are their appeals to Chemosh. Moab is ashamed of him (verse 13). He and his priests will go into captivity (verse 7). The soldiers no longer attempt any resistance (verse 14).

One passage in this oracle has special historical importance,

* Driver, Authority and Arch. 105; Cam. Anc. Hist. 389.

† Davidson, Camb. Bible, Zeph., p. 97.

‡ Reading (verse 8) for גְּבוּלִי־נרולמ, LXX ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρειά μου.

§ Orelli, Jer., p. 192; Peake, Comm., p. 492.

‖ Reading for מִבְּיִת־מבין. This verse is not in the LXX.

¶ For צעוריה (verse 4) read צוֹעָרָה, LXX εἰς Ζογάρα.

that in which the prophet, under the figure of wine left to stand on the lees and not poured out, states that Moab had never, like Israel and Judah, seen its inhabitants deported into captivity (verse 11 *f.*). She had always, as we have seen, averted this calamity by timely submission. But now "tilters" would pour out the wine and break the bottles. In another oracle Jeremiah had declared that Moab, among other surrounding peoples, would have to drink the cup of the wine of the Divine anger, meaning the sword Jahveh was sending among them (Jer. xxv. 15-29). Doubtless in both oracles the prophet thought of Nebuchadnezzar as the instrument of Divine vengeance. But a truer view of the real danger of Moab was given by Ezekiel when he prophesied the ruin of her cities (naming Beth Jeshimoth [Num. xxxiii. 49; Josh. xii. 3], Baal Meon, and Kiriathaim) by the "sons of the East"—that is, "the Arabs"—who would take possession of Moab and Ammon and execute judgments on Moab (Ezek. xxv. 8-11).

A little later, in the fourth year of Zedekiah,* we find in Jerusalem embassies from various neighbouring Kings, including the King of Moab, no doubt with the object of founding a league against Babylon, which seems to have come to nothing (Jer. xxvii. 1 *f.*).

The end of the Moabite state came, as Ezekiel had foreseen, from Arabia. The Nabathean Arabs conquered Moab as they conquered Edom. We have no means of knowing when this conquest took place. Josephus† speaks of "Arabians such as the Moabites," and in enumerating cities which Alexander Janneus took from the Arabians he names Madeba and Zoar.‡ Apparently Alexander also captured Heshbon.§ At an earlier date we find Jonathan the Maccabee warring with the Nabatheans near Madeba (1 Mac. ix. 35-42). Perhaps the earliest reference is to be found in the history of the campaign of Antigonus and Demetrius against the Arabians in 311, when they found the latter pursuing the industry of obtaining asphalt from the Dead Sea, which seems to imply the possession of Moab.‖

In a late apocalyptic vision preserved in Isaiah, in which Moab is pictured as straw beaten down in a dung hill, and as a swimmer spreading out his hands in vain, the doom of Moab is felt to be complete and final. "Jahveh lays low *his pride* with the plots of his hands. Yea, thy steep lofty walls He lays low, brings down, casteth to the earth, to the dust" (Isa. xxv. 10-12). The days of independent Moab are ended, never to return.

W. W. CANNON.

* In this passage "Jehoiakim" is written in error for "Zedekiah." See xxviii. 1; Orelli, Jer., p. 116. † Ant. xiii. 13, 5. ‡ *Ibid.*, xiv. 1.
§ Ewald, Gesch., E.T. v. 391.
‖ Niese, Gesch. der Griesch. u. Maked. Staaten, i. 302.

THE WITNESS OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL TO ITS AUTHOR*

In a case of disputed authorship of an ancient writing, any light that can be thrown upon it by examination of its contents is likely to be of greater value than the testimony of external evidence.

In the present instance every shred of history and tradition outside the book itself has been subjected to the closest scrutiny, with the result that, so far, no general agreement has been reached. Is it possible that a fresh investigation (however brief) of the Gospel itself—of what it says, and especially of what it does not say—may lead to a greater measure of unanimity?

No one can approach the subject without remembering the verdict of the early Church,† a verdict which was unchallenged by contemporary heretics.‡

What, then, does the Gospel say for itself? Few epoch-making books of historical character present so clear an indication of the hand that wrote them, if the contents of the Gospel are taken at their face value, and are interpreted on those principles which form the basis of any impartial historical inquiry. For I regard it as inadmissible, while using parts of the Gospel as a narrative of actual fact, to neutralize other parts of similar character by resolving them into symbol or allegory. No history could stand if any statement which the critic found inconvenient to his theory could be evaporated into unsubstantial mist. But in this case, the thing is constantly done; as with Loisy, "the loved disciple passes into an ideal figure without actual existence"; or, with Prof. Bacon, "the disciple of John xiii. 23-30 is not a disciple of flesh and blood."

The attempt to dissipate the actual is particularly unfortunate in the interpretation of a work like the Fourth Gospel, which, with its attendant Epistle (1 John), is the Gospel of the Incarnation.

The Gospel is anti-Docetic through and through; while its insistence on the truth of a record which depended on what was actually seen by the bodily eye of the witness§ only confirms

* A lecture delivered to members of the Central Society of Sacred Study.

† As Dr. Bernard says: "There is no doubt as to the belief in the second century that John the Apostle was the author of the Fourth Gospel" (*The Gospel according to St. John*, i., p. xlvi).

‡ Only the dislike felt for the Gospel by the "Alogi," an obscure anti-Montanist sect, led them to pillory themselves by the absurd attribution of it to the heretic Cerinthus.

§ John i. 14, ἐθεασάμεθα, of bodily sight. *V.* B. Weiss and W. Bauer, *ad loc.* *Cf.* i. 32.

and bears out this view of the purpose and character of the book.

The material on which we have to work is partly positive and explicit, partly negative, for it speaks by its silence. In its explicit reference to its author, it is unique among the Gospels. It alone deems its authorship of so great importance that it takes care to provide a means of identification, which, without disclosing a personal name, clearly suggests it to anyone who is acquainted, as was the writer himself, with the other Gospels. He is "the loved disciple,"* and "the loved disciple," if, by a process of exhaustion, we isolate him from the Synoptic allusions to the three disciples who stood nearest in their allegiance to our Lord, *must* be the younger son of Zebedee. We are justified in seeking him among the three marked out in the Synoptic record as standing in closest intimacy with their Master, because the fact that he was an Apostle is proved by his presence at the Last Supper; for only Apostles were present.† To this result obtained from the Gospels themselves, when the relevant statements are compared, we can bring other considerations which point in the same direction. It could not have been St. Peter, for he is several times named in conjunction with "the loved disciple." Nor could it have been St. James, for his early death (A.D. 44) at the hand of Herod makes it impossible that he should have written the Gospel, as it is expressly stated that "the loved disciple" had done. It would be unnatural to look for him outside the small band of close adherents for whose society our Lord appears to have had need at critical moments of His Ministry; for one so signalled out by the affection and trust of His Master would not have been excluded, as were the nine, from His immediate companionship. It is significant that five times over he is spoken of as "the disciple whom Jesus loved," whereas in the other Gospels no one follower of our Lord is so designated, although the special intimacy with the three is referred to again and again. I can only conclude that one and the same person is mentioned in all the Gospels, but in different terms corresponding with the different points of view of the writers.

But when we turn to chapter XXI., which has the appearance of an after-thought, an appendix to the Gospel which had already come to a solemn and majestic end in the previous chapter, we find a clear and direct statement as to the authorship of the whole book. "The loved disciple" is once more introduced in the company of St. Peter, who, after our Lord's

* xxi. 20, 24.

† This is plain from Luke xxii. 14; Mark xiv. 17; Matt. xxvi. 20, but especially Luke xxii. 29, 30, where there is no place for one outside the twelve. They are the original (ἀπ' ἀρχῆς) disciples (John xv. 27).

warning of what would befall him in the time to come, turns to the disciple following and asks, "Lord, and what shall this man do?" Clearly the question indicates the status of the disciple of whose future he makes inquiry. It would have been quite beside the mark to ask about the fate of some ordinary adherent. St. Peter means, would *Apostleship* in every case demand the sacrifice already foretold for himself?* And if this is the true meaning of Peter's question, "the loved disciple" is by a valid process of identification declared to be an Apostle. But what was our Lord's answer? Characteristically He declines to satisfy curiosity as to the fortune of others,† but suggests indirectly that at His own return that disciple might still be living to greet Him. The cryptic saying was received with astonishment and gave rise to discussion, men saying that he "should not die." And it was one reason for the addition of this chapter to his already completed Gospel, that the writer, as he grew old and felt the time of his departure was at hand, desired to remove what would be a cause of perplexity to the Church if, when the hour of his death drew near, the Lord had not appeared. And it was to strengthen and confirm the authority with which he spoke—for the matter was urgent—that he went on to declare that he, the disciple concerned, was "the disciple which testifieth of these things and wrote these things." The witness and the actual writer are one and the same person.‡

It is important to notice how the question and our Lord's hypothetical reply are reflected in the early history of the Gospel. It was the belief of the Church that St. John, "the loved disciple," the Apostle lived to a great age. He was *the* Elder, of Papias and of 2 and 3 John, living, so Irenæus tells us, until the time of Trajan. "There must have been no one in Asia, where the Apostle John worked between A.D. 70-100, who did not know who was 'the disciple whom Jesus loved.'§ 'Who,' asks K. Clemen, 'is this long-lived disciple? We must find him among the two sons of Zebedee . . . John only can be thought of.'"‖

If our identification is correct, it follows that alone of all the Gospels St. John is no anonymous writing. When the author wrote, "This is the disciple who is testifying of these things and who wrote these things," he practically spoke in the first person; "the loved disciple" is the equivalent of "I," as the people knew.¶ As to identity there could be no question at the time.

* Lightfoot speaks of "the anxiety which he shows to learn his brother Apostle's destiny." (*Bibl. Essays*, p. 186).

† *Cf.* Luke xiii. 23.

‡ xxi. 24, ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ τούτων—*i.e.*, is now bearing his witness (by his preaching); καὶ ὁ γράψας ταῦτα—*i.e.*, actually at a definite time wrote the Gospel.

§ Gutjahr, *D. Glaubwürdigkeit des Irenaischen Zeugnisses*, p. 188.

‖ *D. Entstehung des Joh. Evangeliums*, p. 338. *Cf.* Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, pp. 432, 433.

¶ *Cf.* Dom J. Chapman in *J.T.S.*, October, 1928 (*Names in the Fourth Gospel.*)

The presence of so great and interesting a figure as the last of the twelve Apostles, living and teaching and then handing to his hearers the written recollections of his wonderful experience when he walked with his Lord in the days of His flesh, must have made an impression which could not be effaced. If to some minds the second clause of verse 24, an assurance by those who received the Gospel from his hands that they "knew that his testimony was true," appears gratuitous and uncalled for in such a case, we have to remember the difficulty which would arise, as the Gospel began to circulate in neighbouring Churches, from its striking deviation from the other three.* The clause gives the impression that so new and startling a presentation of the Saviour's Ministry had already met in some quarters with a certain hesitation. That this was the case about the middle of the second century is evident from the existence of the Alogi and their strange ascription of the Gospel to the heretic Cerinthus. We have no precise knowledge of the circumstances attending its reception. The attestation cannot therefore disprove the evidence of Apostolic authorship which, as we have seen, the chapter as a whole brings forward.

But the Gospel contains another indirect allusion to its writer, which points in the same direction. When St. Peter followed Christ and His captors to the hall of Caiaphas, he was accompanied by "another disciple" (ἄλλος μαθητής), one who "was known to the Chief Priest," and, after entering, returned and "brought in Peter." Who could this disciple be but the one whom we find so frequently in the company of St. Peter, sometimes named as the loved disciple, sometimes as John, the Son of Zebedee ?† The incident, trivial in itself, at once becomes important when it is seen to bear upon the eye-witnessing of the writer. When Scholten, followed by others, maintains that a Galilean fisherman could not have been an acquaintance (γνωστός) of the High Priest,‡ he not only unduly presses the meaning of γνωστός, but mistakes the social and class conditions of the time and place.

So far, explicit and indirect allusions of the Gospel to its

* "And we know that his testimony is true." Verses 24, 25 formed part of the earliest text of the Gospel. "The narrative could never have left off with xxi. 23" (Moffatt, *Introduction to the N.T.*, p. 576). "We have here (verse 24) a very early attestation of the genuineness of the Gospel, and . . . it is very difficult on any just principles of criticism to set it aside" (J. Drummond, *Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 261).

† "Il est probable que ce disciple est le bien-aimé" (Loisy, *Le Quatr. Évangile*, p. 128). So, too, Th. Zahn, *Einleitung in d. N.T.*, ii., p. 480.

‡ *D. Evang. Johan.*, p. 379. B. Weiss replies: "It is hard to see why not." In *Meyer's Komment. D. Evang. des Johan.*, p. 27. "The Evangelist actually and directly refers to himself" (G. W. Wade, *New Testament History*, p. 228). *Cf.* the similar allusion of another Gospel writer (Mark xiv. 51, 52).

authorship have been considered. It speaks even more plainly by its silence. The most cursory comparison of the two strains of Gospel narrative reveals a strange and, at first sight, perplexing omission in St. John. In the Gospel proper neither James nor John is named. They only appear—and then merely as "the Sons of Zebedee"—in the enumeration of disciples which forms the opening of chapter XXI. In the Synoptic record their names are linked with St. Peter in closest companionship with Christ on momentous occasions of His Ministry.* The significance of the omission is heightened by the fact that St. John has a striking propensity for giving the names of persons who only incidentally come in contact with our Lord. How is the omission to be accounted for? Not from ignorance of the historical situation. The writer had been an eye-witness of what he relates, and the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke—and perhaps St. Matthew—were known to him. Still less could it have been from any wish to belittle, or to compare, the two disciples disadvantageously with St. Peter. Such a motive would render it improbable that one who cherished it could have been the kind of man chosen by our Lord for His closest intimacy, as the writer is stated to have been so chosen.

There is only one reasonable explanation of the problem. One of the two unnamed brothers is the writer of the Gospel. The whole book is aflame with his devotion to the Person and the cause of his Master. He will not allow any personal consideration of his own to intrude upon his recital. Himself unnamed, his brother and his mother—so prominent in the other Gospels—are not mentioned; and as if conscious of the notice which would be taken of his omissions, he is careful to lift a corner of the veil which covers him, by his use of the term "the disciple whom Jesus loved."

But if the desire to sink his own personality in the greater interests of his work and its purpose can be easily understood, if he "who wrote these things" was the loved disciple and Apostle John, it becomes inexplicable on the theory that the author was one who had "in his youth come into personal contact with John," and had conceived "a mystical veneration for the aged Apostle"†—the loved disciple. For, in the first place, there would, in that case, have been no sense in the omission of the names of the Apostle and the members of his family which is so startling a feature of the Gospel.‡ But what is more significant, the ethical aspect of the question would arise. It would mean that the disciple was *posing as the Apostle* and, by

* *Cf.* Mk. ix. 2 *f.*; xiv. 33 *f.*

† Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, p. 433.

‡ The omission is not explained by the plea that the writer idealized St. John.

the artifice of a feigned humility, sheltering what would amount to a forgery under the ægis of John; and this, with the connivance of those elders of Ephesus, who added "we know that his testimony is true" after the statement "this is the disciple which testifieth of these things and wrote these things."* Besides, this suggested disciple of St. John must have been nothing less than a literary prodigy, if on the strength of a brief intercourse in his youth "with the Apostle—perhaps also a few never-to-be-forgotten words of Christ derived from his lips,"† he was able to write such a work as the Gospel when the century was drawing to a close. And what must have been the mental condition of the Church of Ephesus, if between the reception and the general publication of the Gospel, men were able to persuade themselves that what had been given them by one who had once for a short time come across the Apostle in early days was the actual work of the Apostle himself? Life and its issues were too serious for such heedlessness and confusion of thought to prevail. The idea is psychologically absurd.‡

So far we have been dealing with certain positive and negative indications of its authorship which lie upon the surface of the Gospel; and if we take them at their face value, they seem to converge upon the Apostle John.

When we look into the character and form of the material of the book, especially of the record of our Lord's sayings, thoughts arise in the mind which point in the same direction. Not only do the substance and the style of the sayings themselves present a striking contrast to those of the earlier Gospels,§ but they convey to any candid mind two distinct impressions. (1) They contain teaching of such a character that we feel instinctively that they *must* have been first upon the lips of the Incarnate Word before they found a place in the Gospel. (2) The Evangelist heard, he did not invent them, and the fact of their reception by those to whom he handed his record points not only to their belief in its genuineness but to the unique authority of the writer, not only as eye- and ear-witness of what he reported, but as possessing the prestige of the last surviving member of the original Apostolic band.

* For Streeter, like Bacon and Charles, places the "martyrdom" of St. John c. A.D. 66 (*ibid.*). If this supposed martyrdom ever occurred, it must have become known. How could the ascription of the Gospel to him ever have taken place?

† Streeter, *ibid.*, p. 433.

‡ Much has been made of a supposed early tendency to place writings under the shelter of Apostolic origin. *Cf.* Streeter, *op. cit.*, p. 560. But surely the primitive procedure was in the other direction. No attempt was made to father the Second Gospel on St. Peter, or the Third on St. Paul, notwithstanding the known connection subsisting in each case. It was freely admitted that the authors were "Apostolic men," but not Apostles. *Cf.* Tert., *Adv. Marc*, iv. 2.

§ "The Fourth Gospel is a work apart from the rest, unique" (Batiffol, *Orpheus et l'Evangile*, p. 194).

To take one or two instances of sayings which give rise to these impressions. Our familiarity with the language of Chapter VI., and our sense of the vast effect which it has had on the faith and the life of the Christian Church, take from the strangeness and incongruity which it could not fail to present to one who came to read it for the first time. Those who received it from the Evangelist must at least have been startled as were those who, on hearing it from Our Lord's own lips, said, "This is an hard saying; who can hear it?" and "went back and walked no more with Him." But that He did so speak is, I think, rendered certain by the fact that in the Synoptic account of the institution of the Eucharist, His words "This is My Body," "This is My Blood," presented no difficulty. At any rate, there was no questioning, and it is a valid inference that some such instruction as that contained in Chapter VI. must have previously been given. On what ground of literary and spiritual probability can we decline to recognize in that chapter the hand of a disciple whose opportunity for knowing the mind of his Master was unique and whose personal authority in the Church was acknowledged by all? The chapter taken in connection with the Synoptic record of the institution and the tacit approval of the threefold narrative which Chapter XIII. appears to give is, perhaps, the strongest link of internal evidence for the composition of the Gospel by a disciple of outstanding position and influence which the book contains. In the shadowy figure of another "John the Elder" created by Eusebius' manipulation of the obscurities of Papias, one fails to recognize such a person; while it is to be remembered that neither in Papias nor in any other early writer whose works lay before him, did Eusebius find any reason for dissenting from the general belief of the second century as to the Apostolic origin and authority of our Gospel.

An analogous kind of evidence from within is furnished by the discourses in Chapters III. and IV. To the member of the Sanhedrin our Lord discloses the mystery of regeneration, the New Birth, by which the natural man acquires that second nature which alone can fit him for the Kingdom of God. However dimly foreshadowed in pagan mystery rites and in Jewish reception of proselytes, Christ's announcement to Nicodemus was a revelation of the first magnitude. As by a lightning flash, it illuminates the whole question of the relation of God and Man. Again, in His discourse with the woman of Sychar, not only is the whole discourse charged with revelation of Divine truth of the highest order—the spiritual nature of the Eternal God and the corresponding requirement of spiritual worship in those who come near to Him; but note the abnormal character of the whole

incident—such disclosures made to such a hearer, ending with the Self-revelation which laid bare to the poor and erring peasant woman that he who stood before her was himself the Christ—the desire of Jew and Samaritan alike, "the hope of all the ends of the earth." There is nothing in the whole range of the Gospel literature that, in the strangeness of its circumstances, in our Lord's choice of a recipient of His teaching, is more astonishing in its own clear proof that He who is here described as thus speaking did so speak, and that he who enshrined *such* teaching, given in *such* circumstances in his Gospel, was a true witness.

It is in his record of the teaching of Christ about His own Person that the Fourth Evangelist rises to the highest plane of evangelical narrative and, at the same time, reduces the theory of authorship by some otherwise unknown follower to absurdity. The Christological problem of the early Apostolic Church was how to bring the Person of the crucified and risen Jesus of Nazareth into such a relation with the Eternal Godhead of the Father as not to imperil the truth of the divine unity—the chief contribution of Hebrew thought to the religion and philosophy of all succeeding time. In this, St. John had the advantage of his Palestinian upbringing: for whatever traces of Ephesian Hellenism we detect in the Prologue, the Gospel, as Burney has placed beyond doubt, is throughout the work of one who thought and moved in the spirit and atmosphere of the Jewish people. This fact renders the more secure the lofty claims to unity and equality with the Father which he places in the mouth of our Lord:* while the pre-existence of the Logos, which he assumes and does not attempt to prove in the Prologue, finds its confirmation in Christ's own words as the narrative proceeds. His doctrine of the Person of our Lord is rooted in monotheism, and it is one of the chief advantages which we owe to his Gospel that, written as it was with full knowledge of the Synoptic record and of the stages of thought reached in the Pauline Epistles and Hebrews, he was able, from his recollection of Christ's own words, to confirm the growing apprehension by the Church of the divine-human Personality of its Founder.

And this without impairing the hold on the divine Unity.† In no other Gospel is the supremacy of the Eternal Father so strongly enforced as in the Johannine words of Christ about His

* *Cf.* viii. 58, x. 30; *cf.* i. 1.

† *Cf.* v. 19, 30; vi. 29, 38; vii. 28, 29; xi. 41, 42. The presence of this double strain in St. John's record of Christ's own statements of His relation to His Father—equality of essential nature combined with subordination in office and function—presents a contrast which seems almost to amount to a contradiction and is one of the strongest internal proofs of the unique spiritual competency and influence of the writer. It points to no less an authority than what was possessed by the Apostle.

own relation to God as His messenger. Nowhere else is the completeness of His human nature—bodily weakness, partiality in human friendship, human needs and necessities—more fully made known.* If the Fourth Gospel soars to the heavens on the wings of inspired speculation, under the guidance of Christ's own well-remembered teaching,† it never forgets the firm earth on which the Incarnate Son once trod as man. There is no trace in the Gospel of any theory of adoptionism—of any process of the deification of a man—in its picture of our Lord. Chronologically, the knowledge of Christ as man came first: it must have been so, in the intercourse of daily life. The impression that He was more than man, coming we know not how, growing day by day as men watched Him, confirmed and authenticated at Easter and Pentecost, gave to the Church the power to differentiate between the Divine activities and functions of the One Eternal God and to lay the foundation of the truth of the Threefold Personality which was in time to be everywhere acknowledged as the Christian Creed. It was a mighty task to which the Evangelist set his hand. He has given to the world the supreme and final representation in our Lord's own words of the true character of His Divine-human Person. In the Prologue he has himself unfolded and interpreted its meaning. What human language can do, has been done here. But as it has been finely said: "None of our Gospels can present that (the Eternal Gospel), not even John. The Eternal Gospel remains unwritten. Gleams of it shine in every Gospel. It will first be revealed in the fullness of its truth in the future. That will be the time when the written Gospels will cease to be—John the last of all."‡

If our view of the genuine character of the Gospel is borne out by what has been said, need we hesitate to ascribe it to any less a witness, by eye and ear, than the Apostle John ?§ The book itself shows that its writer had abundant opportunity of obtaining the material necessary for his task and that he used it. Analogy, if it cannot prove, is often illuminating. It is now recognized that the teaching assigned to Socrates in certain dialogues of Plato was that of the Master himself, not of the writer of the dialogues, as so often asserted. Eucleides states: "I made notes of the sayings of Socrates at once on going home and afterwards at my leisure wrote them out as I remembered

* *V.* iv. 6, xiii. 23, xix. 28.

† xiv. 26.

‡ H. Windisch, *Johannes u. die Synoptiker*, 1926, p. 186.

§ In view of his opinion that the actual writing of the Gospel was by another hand, Dr. Bernard's admission is very significant: "To the mind of the early Church at Ephesus it was the *evidence* for the words and deeds of Jesus' life and death that was the important matter, and for this they had the testimony of the last of the Apostles" (*The Gospel according to St. John*, i., p. lxiv).

them.* If the devotion of the disciples of the Athenian Sage led them thus to treasure and record his sayings, is it not probable that those are right who think that a disciple of Jesus of Nazareth, who stood so near to Him as the Evangelist is again and again said to have done, may have made written memoranda of His teaching ?†

So far is the Gospel from being a mere reflection of the beliefs and hopes of the Church of the close of the first century, or an imaginative sketch of what our Lord would have said if confronted with the circumstances of that time, the direct opposite is the historic situation. The Gospel pulsates with the life and movement of the period which it professes to describe. Only if we so read it shall we learn its meaning. "The words of eternal life" that stand out on its pages are His to whom the writer assigns them.

C. F. NOLLOTH.

SACRAMENTAL THEORY

THEOLOGIANS owe a great debt of gratitude to Mr. Shebbeare for his article on "The Evangelical Conception of the Sacraments" in the April number of THEOLOGY. A chief cause of the confusion and perplexity which beset the sacramental doctrine and practice of the Church of England today is the simple fact that our Evangelical and Modernist theologians have for more than a generation past neglected the working out and constructive restatement of sacramental theory. For the most part they have contented themselves with negative criticisms of statements and claims issuing from the Catholic side. And even where they have attempted positive exposition, the lack of any sympathetic knowledge and understanding of Catholic orthodoxy has marred the value of their work. Now at last Canon Lilley's book and Mr. Shebbeare's article promise a new epoch, and hold out real hope that a mutual understanding on this great subject between the different schools of Anglican theology is a practical possibility. May I plead with Mr. Shebbeare to expand his article into a book ?

* Plat., *Theætetus*, p. 143. W. Pater remarks: "The Phædo of Plato has impressed most readers as a veritable record of those last discourses of Socrates" (*Plato and Platonism*, p. 94).

† *Cf.* J. Abrahams in *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, p. 181. He speaks of "the cumulative strength of the arguments adduced by Jewish writers favourable to the authenticity of the discourses in the Fourth Gospel." G. Salmon, *The Human Element in the Gospels*, p. 274: "The more I study the Gospels, the more convinced I am that we have in them contemporaneous history . . . stories told of Jesus . . . which had been put into writing while He was yet alive." Ed. Meyer takes a similar view (*Ursprung u. Anfänge des Christentums*, 1921, i., p. 236). According to L. Bertholt, the discourses were written down by St. John in Aramaic soon after they were spoken.

All utterances on a subject deeply interesting to the reader, which seem to him intensely relevant and valuable, impel him to promote further discussion by expressing his own agreement and dissent. The strength of that natural impulse must be my excuse for troubling readers of THEOLOGY with some comments of my own on Mr. Shebbeare's views.

First, I must record my whole-hearted acceptance of the positive principles of Evangelicalism as Mr. Shebbeare interprets them. I agree that in principle the one obstacle to the reception of grace is defect in the moral and spiritual disposition of the soul. For that reason it seems to me, as to Mr. Shebbeare, quite unsatisfactory to describe the grace received—*e.g.*, by a faithful Quaker—as an "uncovenanted mercy," or to suggest that the outward signs of sacraments duly performed can alone give legitimate *assurance* and *guarantee* that grace is given and received. It cannot then be true that, in the ordinary sense of the words, any sacrament is *universally* necessary to salvation. We should rather affirm that certain sacraments are necessary to universal salvation—*i.e.*, that salvation cannot be extended to all without the regular practice of these sacraments in the Catholic Church. This I understand Mr. Shebbeare to admit; and I should go on to accept the Tridentine declaration that Baptism is not *liberum*, if *liberum* be understood to imply that the individual is under no *obligation* to be baptized. Again, in regard to the Eucharist, I accept with enthusiasm Mr. Shebbeare's statement that we should govern all our behaviour on wholly rational and intelligible principles. And these principles involve for me, as for him, the doctrine that the consecrated elements in the Eucharist are positively changed from common bread and wine only in relation to their context in the sacramental rite. Outside that context I cannot affirm their positive and special character as sacrament.* Several people have told me that they find "great difficulty" in this notion that the consecrated species do not necessarily retain outside or after the sacramental rite the same sacramental character which they have within it. I have never been able to appreciate the reason for this difficulty, and I welcome Mr. Shebbeare's remarks upon the subject.

But, strangely enough, I find myself most markedly differing from Mr. Shebbeare at the point where he seems to me too easily to accept from orthodox Catholic theologians the cardinal principle, *sacramentum, cum sit signum, habere nequit causalitatem quæ prætergrediatur rationem signi.* To my mind this is the most fundamental issue at stake.

* I can affirm a *negative* holiness of a very real kind as enduring outside the rite, in so far as the elements remain objects consecrated and set apart for a most holy use.

Reflection leads me to conclude that there are two and only two general and ultimate relations between things "outward" or "material" and things "inward" or "spiritual," viz., *significance* and *instrumentality*. By calling these *ultimate*, I mean that they are not further analyzable, and that each is distinct from the other. Take, *e.g.*, the sentence: "Mr. Shebbeare is a learned and profound theologian." In uttering this statement I have expressed a proposition in words, or made a verbal judgment.* The words of which it consists are in their proper order symbolic, and they have a twofold relation of significance, (1) towards my opinion of Mr. Shebbeare's theology, and (2) towards Mr. Shebbeare's theology itself. Thus the proposition or judgment may be said to signify (express) something in my mind, and also to signify (indicate) something in Mr. Shebbeare's mind. But it stands also in a relation of instrumentality towards my purpose of informing other people of what I take to be a truth. The verbal proposition is then both symbol and instrument, both sign and means. But in order to have value as a means (*i.e.*, in order to be useful or efficacious) it must first have value as a sign—*i.e.*, it must convey a meaning which is *understood*. In other words, its usefulness or efficacy is wholly derived from its significance.

Now it seems to me that in all cases the value or function proper to a sign consists in the presentation of something signified to the conscious† mind. If then the "causality" of sacraments is limited to the causality proper to signs, their action on the soul must follow the same general law which governs the functioning of language. In that case sacraments may indeed be said both to signify something concerning God, and to effect God's purpose of conveying to the soul the truth which they signify. But their instrumental efficacy must depend wholly on their significance—*i.e.*, they can only be efficacious because and in so far as their meaning is understood in the consciousness of the recipients. In other words, a sacrament will be effective only as a kind of acted sermon. Just as the hearer of a sermon can say more or less how much good he may

* I am not, of course, attempting to use the terms *proposition* and *judgment* with technical accuracy, which requires careful distinction between them.

† I purposely omit "the subconscious" from this discussion. I take the term *subconsciousness* to denote all lower and dimmer forms of consciousness descending to *unconsciousness* as a limiting case. It is certainly true that signs can convey meaning to the subconscious mind and through it affect the mind as a whole. They act thus most effectively when the main attention of the mind is so far directed elsewhere as to make it incapable of criticism, or, best of all, when the mind is in a hypnoidal state. Hence the deleterious effects of hymn-book theology and stained-glass windows. But I hope no Christian will wish to add, "Hence also the special efficacy of sacraments." In considering the accessory details of ceremonial it is, of course, a duty to weigh their probable influence on subconsciousness; for these are not intended to occupy the main attention of consciousness.

reasonably suppose himself to have derived from it, so the partaker of a sacrament must be able to say more or less how much grace on this occasion he may reasonably suppose himself to have received from it. The meaning of sermon and sacrament is sometimes more, sometimes less, vividly impressed on the mind; and (if we leave out the case of disagreement or conscious rejection) according to the vividness of the conscious impression the grace received is roughly to be measured. Just in the same way the sight of a flag may stir different degrees of patriotic feeling in different minds, or in the same mind on different occasions. The same general law applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to the effect of music, of pictorial or literary art, and of natural beauty. The effect of all these on the soul is measured in terms of the impression produced on the conscious or subconscious mind by way of significance either of intellectual truth or of emotional feeling.

But no Catholic, and only some Evangelicals, would really be satisfied by an account of sacramental efficacy given in these terms.

I may, however, be told (though Mr. Shebbeare does not urge this argument) that I am neglecting the analogy to be found in the ritual acts connected with legal and social ceremonies—investitures, conferring of honours, and the like. Here, it may be said, the appointed actions clearly have the nature of signs, and yet they do convey something actual to the recipient, beyond what lies in his appreciation of the thing signified to his conscious mind. But in any case such analogies seem to fail at the essential point. For there is nothing *mysterious* in the efficacy of the ceremonies in question. And by this denial I mean that these ceremonies can reasonably be supposed to effect only what the participants can clearly and consciously understand to have been effected. If they do confer something more than that which results from the conscious appreciation of the meaning of the ceremony, what is that something? Clearly, it is not the actual enjoyment or possession of the office or honour or property with the conferring of which the ceremony is concerned; it is the acknowledged *right* or *title* to such possession or enjoyment. And, no matter how ingeniously the dialectical skill of theologians may disguise the fact, to affirm that what the outward acts of a sacrament convey is merely a *right* or *title* to the grace of God, inevitably robs them of just that value which the simple-minded worshipper most clings to, and which the Council of Trent intended to safeguard by declaring that the sacraments *continent et conferunt gratiam*. (Moreover, I should humbly agree with St. Paul, and differ from the Revisers of our English Bible [see Jn. i. 12, R.V.], in holding that to speak of a right or title to *grace* is a contradiction in terms.)

Broadly speaking, it seems to me that to assert that sacramental efficacy can in principle be accounted for in terms of psychology, to assert that the causality of sacraments is only the causality proper to signs, and to deny that there is anything essentially *mysterious* in the working of sacraments, all come to the same thing in the end. And, if Mr. Shebbeare is satisfied with these three propositions, I must part company with him, though I should not, as I claim, part company with reason or with intelligible principles of thought and behaviour. On the contrary, just as it is an irrational limitation of God's love and power to suppose that God does not bestow His spiritual gifts outside sacramental rites, so it seems to me an equally irrational limitation to suppose that He does not bestow gifts in His sacraments except through the causality which these possess *as signs*. In the former case we should limit God by the forms of institutional religion; in the latter case we should limit Him no less really by the feeble flickering light of human consciousness. All I seek to affirm is that, given a faithful humble disposition of the will towards receiving God's gifts, God may and does, both through sacraments and apart from them, bestow much more on the soul than anything of which its consciousness can be aware. Such efficacy remains necessarily mysterious; but I cannot see that it is either irrational or unintelligible or even miraculous, or that to believe in it is superstition.

The fact is, surely, that it is irrational to suppose that any natural analogy or scientific description can enable us clearly to understand or conceive God's action upon us either within or without sacraments. At every moment God's presence is upholding the soul in life, and no finite consciousness can clearly present to itself all the methods of His most intimate interaction with every thought and deed and feeling. "Closer is He than breathing, nearer than hands and feet." Why, then, should we not suppose that God uses an appointed sacramental action so as to be, not only the sign of a presence and gift realized through consciousness of what the sign signifies, but also the direct means of a bestowal, the reality of which *makes* the sacramental action significant? In other words, I would suggest that it is not more true to say that the efficacy of a sacrament depends on its significance, than that its significance depends upon its efficacy. Certainly I should affirm that it is partly because the simple ritual of Holy Communion means and suggests so much to my mind, that I believe that in it I receive the inflowing presence and power of my Lord. But I should equally affirm that it is partly because I believe that in the Holy Communion I receive that presence and power more really than my consciousness can ever testify, that the sacrament is to me so deeply

significant. And so again, when the question is of infant baptism, I find no intellectual scandal in believing that in the baptism God actually receives and blesses an unconscious child, and sows the seed of spiritual life in its nascent soul. Why should we *confine* the effect of the sacrament on the child to that formal incorporation into the Church, in respect of which the sacrament is in principle no more of a mystery than any other ceremony of admission? Is not the limitation the product of a false rationalism depending ultimately on the dogma: *sacramentum, cum sit signum, habere nequit causalitatem quæ prætergrediatur rationem signi*?

The doctrine of the eucharistic presence, however, raises a special problem owing to the identification* expressed in the words "This (bread) is My Body." Here, like Mr. Shebbeare, I make my appeal to the principle that the *thing*—*i.e.*, in this case the consecrated element—must not be considered apart from its *context*—*i.e.*, the sacramental action. In communion itself the outward action is an act of giving and receiving the consecrated element. This act, as I should hold, not only symbolizes and expresses, but also in itself effects, the imparting of our Lord's presence to the soul, in so far as the disposition of the soul is such as to make that imparting possible. For that reason the faith of the communicant is entitled to rely, not just on his *consciousness* of spiritual benefit, but on the thing done, the *opus operatum*. If so, he is bound to identify, spiritually and really, the outward thing given and received—viz., the consecrated element, with the Lord's Body—*i.e.*, the sign-and-instrument of the Lord's presence or parousia. The Body is not "in" or "under" the consecrated element or species; the element is *identified with* the Body; for the body *is* the outward medium through which the spirit acts. As St. Thomas says, when we affirm that Christ Himself is in the consecrated element, we do but affirm a certain relation of the element to Christ;† and that relation is (I should suggest) what is expressed by calling the element the Body. The fact that the relation is itself in this case spiritual, not physical (*i.e.*, that the consecrated element is spiritually, not physically, the Lord's Body) simply precludes all attempt to dissolve the irreducible reality of the mystery, by defining the relation denoted by the word *body* in terms of a physical or quasi-physical connection between the material element and our Lord's presence. Our Lord was

* I do not necessarily mean any *literal* identity or an identity which excludes all difference. In general, when people speak of *literal* truth, I have never been able to understand that their use of the word literal is other than highly metaphorical. And it is a metaphor the exact force of which is very hard to estimate.

† *Per hoc quod dicimus ipsum esse sub hoc sacramento, significatur quædam habitudo ejus ad hoc sacramentum* (*S.T.*, III., Q. 76, Art. 6).

physically related to His earthly flesh in the days of His Incarnation. He is *spiritually* related to the consecrated element in the Eucharist. But both relations are real and "objective"; and, since both earthly flesh and eucharistic element (in its proper context) are really means of His self-expression and action, the relational term *body* can be applied to both. That at least is how I should for myself seek to interpret and restate the essence of Catholic belief concerning the Real Presence.

Mr. Shebbeare, as I understand him, would find difficulty with this doctrine on the ground (among others) that nothing can be truly given which is not also truly received, and, since the outward element is given both to the "unworthy" and to the "worthy" communicant and received by both alike, it must follow that both equally receive the Lord's Body, if once we have identified the Body with the element. Personally, I see no rational objection to the view that our Lord's Body is indeed *offered* equally to both; but that the "unworthy" communicant receives only the material element, or, in other words, that, as he receives the element, it ceases to be to him the sign-and-instrument of the Lord's parousia. The whole notion that the consecrated element must remain continuously identical with the Lord's Body until its material entity disappears seems to me to depend implicitly on the assumption that the relation between the element and the Lord's presence is of a quasi-physical character. This assumption I do find rationally abhorrent; and for that reason I will close by agreeing whole-heartedly with Mr. Shebbeare's condemnation of scrupulosity concerning remnants which through accident or even carelessness are left unconsumed. In this regard let every Christian be, as he says, an *esprit fort*.*

OLIVER C. QUICK.

* [We agree with Canon Quick in deprecating excessive scrupulosity on any occasion. But we do not think that in this case the disappearance of the "material entity" is the relevant point. The relevant point seems to us the purpose and intention of the rite; so long as that remains, and within its compass, the identity of the Lord's Body continues. Similarly, we do not agree with the inference which Canon Quick seeks to draw from his statement on p. 272, that "outside that context" he "cannot affirm" the "positive and special character as sacrament" of the consecrated species. The "context" is the whole purpose of the rite; and it does not seem to us that the reserved Sacrament, for instance, is ever outside that context.—ED.]

THE PROTESTATION OF 1789

THE year of the centenary of Roman Catholic Emancipation has naturally seen several books issued from the Press in celebration of that event, but in none of those which the writer has happened to meet with has any reference been made to the famous Protestation of 1789. This omission is the more remarkable because, in the judgment of contemporaries, it was the Protestation which rendered possible the passing of the Act of 1791, an Act which gave to Roman Catholics some measure of civil, and a larger measure of religious, liberty.

The events which led up to the Protestation will be familiar to students of the period, and only an outline of the chief happenings will be attempted here. In 1782 a committee of ten Roman Catholic gentlemen was formed to look after the interests of the whole Roman Catholic body in England. Five years later the committee was re-formed, and subsequently enlarged by the election of the following three clergy: Bishop James Talbot (Vicar Apostolic of the London District), Bishop Charles Berington (Coadjutor of the Midland District) and Father Joseph Wilks, a Benedictine.

In May, 1788, three members of this committee interviewed Mr. Pitt, who was prepared to allow a Bill for the relief of Roman Catholics to be introduced in the next session, but meanwhile requested the Committee "to furnish him with authentic evidence of the opinion of the catholic clergy and catholic universities, with respect to the existence or extent of the pope's dispensing power" (Butler's *Historical Memoirs*, iv., p. 11). Questions relating to the civil authority and dispensing power of the Pope were accordingly sent to the Universities of the Sorbonne, Louvain, Douai, Alcala and Salamanca; and the answers received were unanimously in accord with the view that the Pope has no civil jurisdiction in England, nor power to dispense with the oath of allegiance to the national sovereign. These answers were transmitted to the Prime Minister. About the same time the Committee commissioned its Secretary, Charles Butler, a lawyer of ability and subsequently author of the *Historical Memoirs of the English Catholics*, to draw up a Bill for presentment to Parliament. In Butler's own words this draft "consisted of several distinct clauses, repealing all the laws which placed the English Catholics in a worse situation than the protestant dissenters; so that, if it had passed in this form, the English catholics would, in respect to all civil rights, have been on a complete level with the protestant dissenters" (Butler, iv., p. 15).

A feeling against existing religious disabilities was rising in

the country at this time, not only among Roman Catholics and Protestant dissenters, but even to some extent in the Church of England itself. An Anglican peer, Lord Stanhope, was in charge of a Bill to give general relief from the penalties of non-conformity to all persons who desired it, irrespective of the particular denomination to which they professed to belong. The prejudice, however, against Roman Catholicism was strong and widespread, a prejudice partly due to the hatred felt for the immigrant Irish labourer, who was underselling his English brother in the keen labour market of the larger towns. To mitigate this prejudice, at any rate among the educated, Lord Stanhope proposed to draw up a document which should explain the principles of the Roman Catholic community in relation to civil government, and should relieve them of some of the suspicion and obloquy which current misrepresentation of their beliefs engendered. The document thus drawn up by Lord Stanhope, with the assistance of others, though not apparently with the aid of any Roman Catholic, was the celebrated Protestation. It was submitted to the Catholic Committee at a meeting held December 17, 1788, when, in view of criticisms received from three of the bishops, some alterations were made in it and then, in its altered form, it was transmitted to the four Vicars Apostolic, Dr. James Talbot, Dr. Thomas Talbot, Dr. Walmesley and Dr. Matthew Gibson, for their approval. It is right to say that Dr. B. Ward's reading of these events is that three of the Vicars Apostolic viewed the Protestation unfavourably from the start, but yielded their assent under pressure and against their better judgment. The fact remains that all four signed it, three with their own hands, Dr. Gibson signing by proxy. (His name was subsequently withdrawn.) Butler's own words in regard to its reception among the Roman Catholic community deserve quotation: "With a very inconsiderable exception, the protestation was signed by all the catholic clergy and laity in England of any note. In the public prints, it was circulated throughout the country. It was received with general approbation. In 1789 it was signed, in London, at a general meeting of the English catholics by every person present. A copy of it was laid before parliament by the committee, with a petition, 'praying to be relieved from certain penalties, to which they lay daily exposed, on the pretence of doctrines which they had solemnly protested against'" (Butler, iv., p. 24). Dr. B. Ward states that "the Protestation was eventually signed by over 1,500 Catholics, of whom 240 were priests," and in a footnote he calculates that in regard to the latter "the proportion of those who signed did not much exceed two-thirds" of the total clergy in the country.

The Protestation is printed in Butler's *Historical Memoirs*, vol. iv., p. 19 ff., and the original was deposited in the British Museum, where it now reposes.

The importance of this corporate presentment of Roman Catholic principles at the time lay in the strong denial of the Pope's power to depose sovereigns and to dispense with the obligation of oaths of allegiance, and in the complete repudiation of the doctrine attributed to Roman Catholics that no faith is to be kept with heretics. It was this clear and emphatic statement of principles which made the way clear for the Act of Relief of 1791. There is scarcely need to point out how in these matters the unchanging Roman Church has, in England at any rate, completely changed its views; for Pius V., in the Bull *Regnans in Excelsis*, which sentenced Elizabeth to deposition, adopted an attitude which all the leading English Roman Catholics two hundred years later characterized as "an unchristianlike and abominable position." But it is not this change of front which calls for remark today so much as a further revolution of opinion which has occurred since the Protestation in regard to what is now a central Roman Catholic dogma. That document contained the remarkable statement "we acknowledge no infallibility in the pope," a statement which the four bishops and the leading clergy of the Roman Communion allowed to go forth publicly over the authorization of their own signatures. And a modern Roman Catholic writer, Miss M. D. Petre, in her book, *The Ninth Lord Petre*, which forms an admirable supplement to Dr. Ward's larger History, admits that in the Protestation "first and foremost, we have the explicit denial of papal infallibility" (p. 155). And yet only eighty-one years were to pass before the episcopate and all the clergy of the Roman Communion in England accepted the dogma defining that very infallibility which their predecessors had so explicitly denied.

That the bishops and leading clergy signed the Protestation which contained this denial of papal infallibility is a fact which cannot be disputed; but certain Roman Catholic writers subsequently have either endeavoured to explain away that denial or else quietly ignored it. That sharp-tongued writer, Bishop Milner, for example, in his *Supplementary Memoirs*, suggests that "the circumstance of all the Vicars Apostolic objecting to the Protestation at the first sight of it, certainly forms a strong prejudice against its orthodoxy, or at least its accuracy, and leads the reader to believe that, if it was afterwards signed by them, it was under the cover of glosses and salvoes" (*Suppl. Mem.*, p. 55). Butler admits that Bishops Walmesley, Thomas Talbot and James Talbot made comments upon the Protestation

on first reading it, "in consequence of which, some alterations were made in it" (Butler, iv., p. 13), though no alteration was made in the sentence which denied infallibility; but it was left for Bishop Milner to suggest that they signed it "under cover of glosses and salvoes."

A later writer, Canon Flanagan, who lived to the days when the question of papal infallibility was coming to the fore, records in his *History of the Church in England* the chief points contained in the Protestation, but somehow omits to mention the clause in which the infallibility is denied. Such methods only lead to exposure, and it is well that the exposure, and the real facts, should come from writers of their own Communion, such as Dr. Ward and Miss Petre. The latter's candid admission has already been referred to. In his *Dawn of the Catholic Revival*, Dr. Ward makes it quite clear that his sympathies are with the Vicars Apostolic rather than with the Catholic Committee in the controversy which arose over the signing of the Protestation and the subsequent taking of the Oath; but he does not gloss over the denial of the Pope's infallibility contained in the Protestation. Comparing the Protestation with the terms of the Oath of 1778, he writes, "the Oath of 1778 contains nothing about Papal Infallibility, while in the Protestation the doctrine is repudiated in strong and almost offensive terms" (Ward, p. 143).

The writer has recalled this episode in the life of the Roman Communion in England in pre-Emancipation days not only from motives of historical interest now that Emancipation has achieved its first centenary, but as a matter of some practical importance in regard to Christian Reunion.

It is evident that for the Roman Catholic Church the nineteenth century has been a period of Ultramontane reaction; and the question arises whether that reaction may not lead to another in a contrary direction. Will the ebb and flow of history bring a tide of national feeling, emanating, perhaps, from America, North or South, which will sweep away Italian majorities in the Papal Curia and dissolve the Infallibilist and centralized Papacy into a Communion of nationalist Catholic Churches under the Presidency of a non-Italian Pope? Or will the pessimism of Gwatkin be justified, when he writes thus of the Roman Church since 1870? "No reform is possible—only revolution. An infallible Church must go on setting truth and reason at defiance in intrigues for political supremacy, till she either breaks in pieces, or withers away, or sinks into some gulf of anarchy. Meaner churches may repent and amend; but for Rome reform is suicide" (*Knowledge of God*, vol. ii., p. 219).

Movements for greater independence on nationalist lines

within the Roman Church have so far failed: the Conciliar movement of fifteenth-century Europe, Gallicanism in France, Cisalpinism in England, have all passed away and left Ultramontanism victorious. But perhaps the really significant thing is that there has been a succession of such movements within the Roman Catholic Church, and it is conceivable that the time is not far distant for the commencement of another.

The real distinction among English Roman Catholics today is the distinction between those who welcome and those who regret the intransigent attitude maintained by Pius XI. in his *Encyclical* of January 6, 1928. In that pronouncement he still applies the phrase "the one true Church of Christ" to the Roman Catholic Church, and makes the acceptance of "the authority and supremacy of Peter and his successors" as the condition of entry into "this one Church of Christ." And yet the official Roman Catechism declares that it is Baptism which "makes us Christians, children of God and members of the Church." Here is one of the fundamental incoherences of modern Roman teaching. Those Roman Catholics who adhere to the view that Baptism-membership, not Papal-supremacy-membership, is the essential Scriptural principle, have the consolation of knowing that they are not unchurching millions of baptized fellow-Christians of other Communions. And though they now accept the dogma of Papal Infallibility they should not be allowed to forget that so recently as the end of the eighteenth century their predecessors in England, numbering among them Catholics as devout, learned, and loyal as any today, explicitly repudiated that dogma.

E. H. DUNKLEY.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

The Editor of THEOLOGY expects to be away from England from May 22 to June 14, and would be glad to be spared correspondence relating to the journal during that time. Dr. Lowther Clarke has kindly undertaken to deal with anything which may necessitate attention while the Editor is away.

The April number of the *York Quarterly* contains a striking article by the Archbishop of York on "The Perils of a Purely Scientific Education." His thesis is that the trend of modern education is to train the mind in accuracy of measurement, but not in the more important task of æsthetic and moral appreciation or criticism. Those who read the Archbishop's Presidential address to the Classical Association at Hull last month will rejoice that the humanities have found so doughty and persuasive a champion; and the *York Quarterly* article is in the same powerful vein.

Among contributors to the present issue, Dr. C. F. Nolloth is the author of a number of theological works dealing especially with Christian origins. They include a study of the Early Church and the Ministry published in 1919.

The death of Lord Balfour elicited eloquent tributes to his attitude to religion from Bishop Talbot, his life-long friend, in a letter to *The Times* of April 1, and from the Headmaster of Eton in a sermon in Eton Chapel. Lord Balfour was one of those who stood in the gap in the latter part of the last century, when mechanistic theories of the universe seemed to have the future in their hands. His *Defence of Philosophic Doubt* was a powerful criticism of the prevailing philosophy, which appeared then to have science solid behind it; while his *Foundations of Belief* was a powerful contribution to Christian apologetic, and to that kind of apologetic which lays emphasis on the place of authority in religious belief. Few men have done more in their generation to uphold the claims of spiritual interests in the national life. Such a statesman can ill be spared.

The Village Eucharist (Mowbrays, 1s. 6d.) is the title of a little book of "practical notes" by the Rev. R. H. Nottage, of more than ordinary point, helpfulness, and common sense. The chapter entitled "How to preach about the Eucharist" contains useful outlines for a course of sermons; and a number of the questions and difficulties which come up in pastoral work, when the Church's faith and worship are thoroughly taught, are discussed throughout the book. We recommend it to all whose work lies in the country.

Other pamphlets which we have received include *Ascetic Theology*, by Fr. Northcott, C.R. (A.P.R., 6d.); *National Churches*, by the Bishop of Southampton (S.P.G., 3d.), a careful study of the meaning of national

Churches in the mission field, and of their opportunities and dangers; and a series of S.P.C.K. pamphlets entitled "Church Problems of Today" (3d. each). Disestablishment, Confirmation, or "Bishoping," and Creeds are among the subjects discussed; Dr. Goudge's admirable study, *Priest and Prophet*, and the Archbishop of Dublin's weighty and judicious defence of Episcopacy in *Anglican Orders and Prospects of Reunion* are timely on the threshold of the Lambeth Conference; and *The Relations of Church and State* is the title of the Archbishop of York's memorable speech on Church and State in the Church Assembly last February. At the same time we feel bound to add that THEOLOGY cannot undertake to review pamphlets; and the Editor only makes an exception this time in view of Lambeth.

The April number of *The Review of the Churches* contains the unwelcome news that Sir Henry Lunn is shortly retiring from the Editorship. This representative quarterly has occupied a unique position for many years as providing an open forum for the theologians of all Christian bodies; and it is only one of the many ways by which Sir Henry has devoted himself to the cause of Reunion. That cause has few veterans of such long standing as he: the first Reunion Conference at Grindelwald was held as far back as 1892. Sir Henry must rejoice as he sees the progress which the movement has made since then, and we trust that, though *iam rude donatus* so far as the editorship of the Review is concerned, he may long be spared to continue his great services to the Christian Church.

CORRESPONDENCE

(I)

SIR,

I experienced a mild shock in reading in your April issue, p. 233, that I am taken to be in general agreement with the proposition that "infallibility does not attach to the definitions by which the content of the revelation is expressed, but to the faith which expresses itself, provisionally, in those definitions." The word "provisionally" is surely quite alien to the intention of those who formed the Creed or the Definitions and to the mind of the Church about them. I think the tendencies of thought represented by the four condemned heresies are recurrent, and that there is expressed in the dogmatic decisions a final *no* to any tendency at any period to represent Christ as less than God "of one substance with the Father" or as less than fully human in the Incarnation, or as distinguishable in the Incarnation into two persons, or as otherwise to be thought of than as really subsisting in both natures. I see no reason to believe that metaphysics can ever get on without the ideas of "substance," "person" (in the more abstract sense of continuous self-identity) and "nature." Thus, though of course we are at liberty to criticise the phrases of Creed or Definition, I believe no criticism will be found to overthrow their legitimate claim to finality.

I am wholly one with S. Thomas Aquinas in understanding that when I say "I believe in the Church" I mean nothing else than "I believe in the Holy Spirit who inspires the Church." The "infallibility of the Church" considered as an historical institution in the world, is a phrase very difficult to define, and not very profitable for that reason: but we

seem to me to have good reason to believe that the Creed and the Definitions are in fact irreformable, and represent the movement of the Holy Spirit, who is the truth.

CHARLES GORE.

---

(2)

DEAR SIR,

May I be allowed to correct an error in the article on "Four New Prayer Books" in the March number of THEOLOGY? When in dealing with the Liturgy I stated (p. 146) that Scotland alone requires the Nicene Creed on all occasions, I had overlooked the rubric at the end of the Scottish rite which directs that the Creed, the Exhortation *Ye that do truly*, the Comfortable Words, and the Gloria in Excelsis may be omitted on Week-days except on Red Letter Days.

Yours very truly,

J. C. DU BUISSON.

---

(3)

JESUS-JESHUA

DEAR SIR,

In a letter to me, Prof. Gustaf Dalman writes *re* Dr. Kennett's review of his book *Jesus-Jeshua* in the January number of THEOLOGY:

"The opening sentence of the review ('the latest work of Dr. Dalman consists mainly of conjectures concerning the original Aramaic of our Lord's utterances,' etc.) is against the main purpose of the book, as stated in the Introduction. Moreover, to use a Talmudic phrase, 'let us take the book and see'! But when, in connection with πληροῦσαι (Luke iv. 21), the reviewer says, 'It would, however, have been strange indeed if Hebrew phraseology had not affected the vocabulary of Aramaic-speaking religious people,' etc., the fact is that this 'strange' thing has happened. *Lemalle et-debar Jahve* is rendered in the Targum by *lekayama yat pitgama dadonay*, and even in the Hebrew of the Mishna not *mille* but *kiyem* is used, when referring to 'fulfilment of words' (*cf.* Shebi x. 9, Abot. iv. 9).

"Again, the reviewer asserts that the form of '*rabbuni*' (Mark x. 51; John xx. 16) is not Aramaic but Hebrew. But the fact is that *ribbon* is the Targumical rendering of the Hebrew *adon*, and that it appears in the Hebrew of the Mishna only once (Taan. iii. 8)! It is true that the ending *ōn* is more Hebrew than Aramaic, but we have even in Syriac examples of the same endings in *nesyona*, *galyona*. For examples in Jewish Aramaic, *cf.* my *Aramaic Grammar*, 2nd ed., p. 175 *f.*"

PAUL P. LEVERTOFF.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

Bulletin of the John Rylands Library. January, 1929.

The chief article of theological interest in this number is an essay by the late Dr. Peake on "Paul and the Jewish Christians." He begins by tracing the stages of the emancipation of Christianity from Judaism, "a matter of exceptional difficulty," from the episode of St. Stephen onwards. He does not agree with the position of W. L. Knox, and thinks that Stephen does not go beyond Jeremiah, Micah and the author of

Isaiah lxvi. Further steps are Philip's preaching to the Samaritans and the affair of Cornelius. The stage is thus prepared for St. Paul. In Dr. Peake's opinion the visit to Jerusalem recorded in Gal. ii. 1-10 is identical with that recorded in Acts xv. Titus was not actually circumcised. The Council with its decree and four prohibitions is "one of the most tangled problems in the history of the early Church." The text is far from certain and the exact interpretation very difficult to determine. But Dr. Peake concludes that the received text is correct and that there were one ethical and three "food" prohibitions imposed upon the Gentile converts. The subsequent incident at Antioch points to the possibility that even after the Jerusalem decision Jewish Christians still held themselves bound by the Mosaic Law. At Antioch, a mixed Church, new problems arose. How the controversy ended we are nowhere exactly told, but most probably the victory remained with St. Paul. The question came up again later in the Churches of Galatia and then at Corinth. This forced St. Paul to defend his apostolic position. Echoes of the controversy are found in the Epistle to the Romans. Summing up, Dr. Peake says that "we cannot over-estimate the service which in his steadfast struggle (St. Paul) rendered to Christianity and the Church. . . . The new religion might have been fatally stranded in a backwater of Judaism."

In another article Dr. Rendel Harris discusses "The origin of the cult of Hermes," giving it as his opinion that Hermes-worship is in primitive times connected with the elm-tree. In the great statue of Praxiteles Hermes carries Dionysus, but Dionysus was ivy first and vine later, and vines are, in Italy, trained on elms. The elm, too, has magical powers, hence perhaps the powers of divination possessed by Hermes.

There is also an excellent article on "The Art of Reading," by the Editor of the Bulletin, Dr. Guppy. He wisely recommends reading aloud as an aid to literary perception.

W. R. V. B.

Bulletin of the John Rylands Library. July, 1929.

This number contains a variety of interesting articles. Dr. Calder, the Manchester University Professor of Greek, in "Leaves from an Anatolian Notebook," writes about epigraphical discoveries in Asia Minor having to do with Novatian, Montanist and Encratite sectaries of those parts. Several inscriptions are given in full: one of them refers to the substitution of water for wine in the Eucharist, another to the life and death of a Christian professional athlete who had taken prizes in contests in Phrygia and in Italy.

In another article, Dr. Conway with his usual charm discusses Vergil as a student of Homer, noting how the Roman poet omits or transforms cruel or barbaric elements in the older epic.

There is also a very attractive detailed description of one of the Latin manuscripts belonging to the Library, dealing with the art of letter-writing, "*dictamen*," and giving many examples of what the fifteenth century thought was the proper way of inditing letters to persons of consequence. Some of these letters, it is stated, may be genuine documents.

In this number, again, Dr. Mingana renews the interrupted series of his "Woodbrooke Studies," giving this time the Syriac text and English translation of an account of the "Flight of the Holy Family into Egypt." This seems to have been a chapter from an apocryphal "Life of Christ" in use in the Monophysite West Syrian Church, in Dr. Mingana's opinion the work of a certain Bishop Cyriacus, and dating from the eleventh

century. In the text the story is told of a vision granted by Our Lady to the Patriarch Theophilus of Alexandria wherein she describes to him some of the incidents which befell during the flight into Egypt, centring round episodes occurring on the site of the later shrine of Kuskam. The *motif* of the story seems to be the glorification of this site. There was apparently an Arabic original from which the present Syriac text is a translation.

In other articles Dr. Rendel Harris continues his "Note" on Hermes and the elm tree, and Dr. Fish gives an account of Assyriology in England during and since the war. W. R. V. B.

The Journal of Religion. Vol. x., No. 1.

Two outstanding articles in the current number deserve notice. Indeed, we suggest that one, and that the shortest, might well be published separately as a little pamphlet; for "The Christian Minister and the Old Testament" summarizes admirably and concisely the value for the Christian of the Old Testament. "We need it for a true understanding of Jesus." The other, entitled "Through All to God," though never using the word Sacrament, is a very fine setting forth of the sacramental principle. It only needs a little further working out of its implicit recognitions to be as good a defence of sacramentalism as we know. Starting with the world and then passing through humanity we reach God by way of Christ, because the world is never self-sufficient and social service always leaves something to be desired. When, then, we travel through space and time and life to the Deity, three or four of the great notes or characters of the Christian religion at its best emerge. They are worshipfulness, serenity, power, and hopefulness. If the author could only bring himself to speak of the Incarnation as a Sacrament and to recognize his own thesis, as it were, we should have the Church and Priesthood as sacraments also. It is all implicit in the article, but needs to be made explicit. Dr. Shailer Mathews is, however, only irritating. That orthodoxy regards God as a transcendentalized ruler and is cast in the pattern of politics multiplied by infinity, that God is no more a king than an individual circumscribed by space, that our knowledge of the universe makes sovereignty as a pattern for the conception of human and divine relations futile, that no small part of the confusion of today's religious and moral thought springs from this fact, that the universe of the chemist and physicist and astronomer is too great for any sovereignty, that intelligent people expect no Day of Judgment, and that the shifting of scientific knowledge from the celestial geography of Paul and the New Testament is inexplicable to ecclesiastical religion, are only statements that fill us with astonishment when they do not annoy. Obviously, whether it be St. Paul or Dr. Shailer Mathews, no one can explain truth otherwise than by the universe as it is known to him and society as normally constituted. If they are only modern "high-brows" who can enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, then, we suggest, the advocates of ultra-modernism must abandon any further attempt to square their conclusions with the Gospel, for it is quite impossible to think of them as those little children whom we must resemble if we do desire to enter therein. Dr. Mathews might like to read again his own words substituting the word Modernism for that of Orthodoxy: "To modify its pattern is to endanger the entire structure of orthodoxy. It is no wonder, therefore, that the advocates of orthodoxy should abandon intellectual consistency when engaged in the task of self-defence. They become reckless in their antitheses with the sole result that they win the approval of those who agree with them." H. S. M.

The Canadian Journal of Religious Thought. Vol. vi., Nos. 5 and 6; Vol. vii., No. 1.

An interesting survey of the religious view of the world in the light of the New Physics, referring to a total eclipse of the sun predicted for August 11, 1999, points out that it would be useless for people who are not likely to be alive in 1999 to pray that the eclipse might come earlier so that they might see it, not because God very properly refuses to change His plans to please our idle convenience, but because to grant such a prayer is not within His power. That this rule of necessity, known as Mechanism, pertains to the whole world of the physical sciences has long been a truism, but the outlook is now very different because the conceptions of the physicist are more and more approximating to biological ideas. "If, now, the physicist has concluded rightly that Causality is not ultimate, we are confronted by laws that transcend Mechanism even in the physical world. Life functioning through matter is a familiar phenomenon—it is in this relation only that life is known—and the resolution of matter, whether organic or inorganic, into activity helps to make the connection of the two intelligible. With matter as 'thing' replaced by energy-vortices, with an indeterminancy found to reign among quantum and other atomic behaviour, we seem brought by discovering the true nature of the physical to the border-line of a reality of another order." We have long wanted to see this principle applied to the doctrine of Transubstantiation, or alternatively to the interpretation of the Sacramental Presence.

H. S. M.

Zeitschrift für die A.T.liche Wissenschaft. 1929. Heft 4.

Dom de Bruyne, O.S.B., begins with a study of Ecclesiasticus, in which he shows how many problems remain unsolved. G. Kuhn contributes textual and exegetical notes on the first 16 chapters of the same book. H. T. Obbink of Utrecht discusses images of Yahweh, concluding that the Second Commandment has no such images in view; indeed they never existed. There was no traditional form in which Yahweh could be represented. What was done, and is forbidden by the Commandment, is the introduction of cult-objects from other worships to symbolize the God of Israel. Jeroboam copied the golden calf from the sanctuaries of Hadad-Ramman, a well-known Syrian god, who was represented as riding upon a bullock. But he made no attempt to represent Yahweh, who was thought of as riding upon the bullock, as upon the Ark. The article is most attractive, but says nothing about the archæological evidence and the many cult-objects which apparently represented Yahweh. W. W. Cannon, a frequent contributor to Theology, shows that Isa. lxi. 1-3 is probably a "servant of Yahweh" poem. If he is right, Prof. Torrey's argument, that chapters xl-lxvi. form a unity, is strengthened.

W. K. L. C.

Harward Theological Review. January, 1930.

J. S. Bixler leads off with an interesting study of current German religious thought. There are five main groups: (1) Roman Catholics, especially Przywara of Munich, who combines the Augustinian and Thomist elements and claims that Catholicism, which reaches out beyond the immanence-transcendence controversy, is therefore the universal religion. (2) Phenomenology, founded by Husserl of Freiburg, and now led by Heidegger, also of Freiburg, which is strongly influenced by

Catholicism. It "attempts to return to the 'phenomenon' not in the Kantian but in the Greek sense of 'that which appears' or 'presents itself.'" The highest form of activity is *contemplatio*, or *theoria*. (3) Barth and the theology of crisis, now familiar to us. (4) Neo-Kantianism, divided into the Marburg and Baden Schools. (5) Unorganized thinkers, who continue the Liberal Protestant traditions of Eucken and Troeltsch.

R. DUNKERLEY describes the present state of debate as regards the Oxyrhynchus Logia. R. P. CASEY discusses the newly discovered Athens MS. of St. Athanasius' *Contra Gentes* and *De Incarnatione*. It is much shorter than the received text, of which it is clearly a revision. There is no evidence of any doctrinal motive, and the phenomena can "best be explained by supposing that Athanasius himself made the revision," or else one of his immediate disciples.

Now it has been almost axiomatic with Biblical scholars that fuller texts are later than shorter ones. Scribes, it is argued, would desire to incorporate the completest version of a sacred book. Prof. A. C. Clark's attempt to prove the contrary has not produced much effect. If it could be shown that St. Athanasius, so to speak, put out an authorized abridgment of his work, some critical judgments might have to be reconsidered.

W. K. L. C.

We have received the Swedish *Kyrkohistorisk Årsskrift* (Church Historical Year Book) for 1928, issued by the Church Historical Society at Upsala. This volume contains one contribution of outstanding value and interest, occupying 172 pages out of a little over 300: a careful account of the legal status of the Russian Church, and of religion in general, in Soviet Russia, by A. de Roubetz, who appears to be a member of the Orthodox Church, holding a post at Upsala University. It would be altogether unfair to the writer to give any sort of a summary of conclusions; so careful and thorough a work needs to be translated. And it deserves it.

A. G. H.

Theologische Blätter. March.

A series of lectures were given at the Berlin Broadcasting Station on the "Church Problems of the Present Day." Prof. Deissmann introduced the series, and two addresses were given on "The 'Œcumenical' Movement of the Present Day," by Prof. M. Dibelius, Heidelberg, and Fr. M. Pribilla, S.J., Munich. Both speakers expressed their views of the prospects of the future reunion of the Churches.

Prof. K. Pröhle gives a summary of the papers read at the Second Lutheran Convention in Copenhagen (June-July last year). The convention was opened by Dr. Söderblom, Archbishop of Upsala.

L. W. P.

REVIEWS

WHO MOVED THE STONE? By Frank Morison. Faber and Faber, Ltd. 6s.

Mr. Morison has written a book of unusual character on the trial and resurrection of our Lord. We are accustomed to devotional studies of the events comprised in the period between the entry into Jerusalem and the first preaching of the Gospel, and the chapters of the Gospels and Acts which deal with them have been the subject of exhaustive literary criticism for many decades. But a study of the historical sequence of events from the standpoint of the human motives, characters, and circumstances of those engaged in them is not so common. And Mr. Morison's study is all the more interesting because, when he began it, he believed that the kernel of the story was simply the death of a supremely good man, and his aim was to disentangle this from the legendary accretions which had grown up around it. It was the records themselves that brought him to another mind. His method, let it be said at once, is not that associated with the severer disciplines of New Testament theology. Textual and literary criticism are alike eschewed, and there are many points of historical criticism which he leaves alone. His plan is rather to concentrate on a few large and undisputed facts, and to inquire into the connexions between them, using the records to illustrate these connexions; and on this basis he builds up a narrative of intense human interest and considerable historical value.

The first fact which Mr. Morison emphasizes and sets himself to account for is the hurried character of our Lord's arrest and trial. The priestly party were determined to be rid of Jesus, if possible: but in that case why did they leave his arrest to the last possible moment, and then apparently have to act with precipitancy? Mr. Morison's view is that they were deterred not only by fear of the people, but by fear of Christ Himself: what might He not do if they tried to take Him? It was Judas's visit to them on the Thursday evening that changed the situation; for what Judas told them was not only the exact place where they could find Jesus, but also that He had been speaking a few moments before in a way that showed He would not resist. There was just time for the priests to get sentence passed and executed before the Feast if they acted quickly. Caiaphas visited Pilate at once and secured his consent to facilitate matters; and, this done, the Temple Guard was sent to

Gethsemane to effect the arrest. Twice the subsequent proceedings nearly broke down—once, when the witnesses could not agree, and only Caiaphas's bold adjuration of Jesus to answer the question whether He were the Messiah kept the action in being; and a second time, when Procula's message almost brought Pilate back to the strict judicial procedure. But the priestly movement was too strong for him, and had its way.

Mr. Morison is, I think, right in rejecting the view that Judas was simply a common informer paid to reveal his Master's secret hiding-place: Jesus was not living in secret, and knowledge of his whereabouts at any moment was not worth the payment of £5. At the same time Mr. Morison hardly seems to cut deep enough. He gives no reason, for instance, for Judas's visit to the priests earlier in the week (Mark xiv. 10, 11), nor any indication of what passed then. And yet the suggestion—made by Schweitzer and others, and more recently by Mr. Lowrie,* that what Judas divulged on this occasion was our Lord's claim to be the Messiah—fits in very well with Mr. Morison's reconstruction. It would account, for instance, for the form and substance of Caiaphas's question when the evidence of the false witnesses had broken down; for the question was one which it would surely be profane for the High Priest to ask unless he were sure of the answer; and it would fall in well both with the urgency and with the hesitancy of the priests in regard to our Lord's arrest. Again, it is not inconsistent with Mr. Morison's view of what Judas divulged on the Thursday evening of his Master's readiness to die. On this view the prominence given to Judas at the Last Supper, attested by the Fourth Gospel no less than the Synoptists, is significant. Readers of THEOLOGY are familiar with the conception of the Eucharist as the act in which our Lord consecrated Himself to His approaching death; and Judas understood His meaning at least thus far, that he knew that Jesus would not resist. And the same lesson, it may be added, must have impressed itself on his mind from the Washing of the Feet. The evidence seems to point, then, to Judas having revealed two secrets—the two great secrets of our Lord's life and teaching: the first, on the Tuesday, that He had claimed to be the Messiah; the second, on the Thursday, that He believed Himself to be such a Messiah as must die and rise again.

Mr. Morison is not less interesting when he passes on to the Resurrection, though there are many who will hesitate to endorse all the details of his reconstruction of the story. He believes, for instance, that the Matthæan story of the guards at the sepulchre rests upon fact, and that it was indeed they who

* *Jesus according to St. Mark.* Longmans.

rolled away the stone. Finding the grave empty, the guards returned in excitement to the city; and they were overheard talking in the street by the young man who had "fled naked" in the Garden of Gethsemane. This young man, further, had overheard our Lord telling His disciples on that night of the trial that He would rise again and go before them into Galilee. Thrilled at what he heard the guard saying, he ran at once to the tomb; and he was sitting in it looking at the ledges, empty save for the grave-clothes, when he was surprised by the women. They were naturally frightened and fled, but not before he had been able to tell them that the Master's prediction was fulfilled.

The critical reader will feel that there is a good deal of guess-work here: apart from the guard, a young man who has to be supposed to have overheard crucial conversations on two quite different occasions becomes rather a creature of fiction. Simpler hypotheses will account for the facts. At the same time Mr. Morison may be right in his view that the figure whom the women encountered in the grave really was a man and not an angel; and he has undoubtedly done a real service to Marcan exegesis in interpreting the women's silence of Mark xvi. 8 by reference to Mark i. 44. As he says, the command to "say nothing to any man" in i. 44 is shown by the context to mean: "See thou say nothing to any man. Keep it to yourself and to those intimately concerned"; and the statement in xvi. 8 that "they said nothing to anyone" should be understood in the same qualified sense.

The force of Mr. Morison's treatment of the Resurrection, however, does not lie in these individual points, but in his clear exposition of the difficulties that beset any attempt to deny, or to evade, the empty tomb. The sudden and rapid rise of Christianity has always been the strongest argument for the Resurrection, but it is not always realized how completely this implies the emptiness of the tomb.

Think of the weekly discussions and disputations in the synagogues. Think of the innumerable private controversies as to whether this Jesus was the Messiah or whether He was not. Think of the highly-placed Sadducees who were prepared to go to almost any length to discredit and overthrow the cause. Think of the opposition suddenly being reinforced by the logical and relentless mind of Saul. Think of all these admittedly historic things, and then reflect that the evidence which could have pricked the bubble was to be obtained for the asking by merely walking a distance no greater than that from Hyde Park Corner to the Marble Arch.

The argument is undoubtedly overwhelming. If the grave was not empty, or if the women went to the wrong tomb, or if the Jews or Romans had removed the Lord's body, *why was not*

the bubble pricked? Instead, the Jews had nothing to fall back on except the fabrication about the disciples having removed it by stealth. Such a story was tantamount to an accusation of blasphemous dishonesty, and may account for the frenzy of Saul's zeal against them. It also means that, if the accusation were false, their message of the risen Messiah was true.

Mr. Morison's book is valuable as redressing a balance which the literary criticism of the Gospels had undoubtedly distorted. In the last resort, what the historian of Christian origins has to deal with is some brute facts—a betrayal, an arrest, some forms of trial, a crucifixion, an empty grave, and the swift spread of Christianity on the basis of belief in Christ's Resurrection. Literary analysis of the documents, like that undertaken by Canon Streeter and Mr. Gardner-Smith, induces a fatal tendency to miss the wood for the trees, and to divert attention from the brute facts or to cloke them in webs of ingenious surmise. The chief value of the book before us is the strong common sense with which it faces the facts and the human situation underlying them. A sober judgment will insist on leaving in obscurity some of the connexions between events which Mr. Morison claims to have discerned. But it will none the less be grateful to him for the main lines of his bold reconstruction of the greatest chapter in the history of the world.

E. G. SELWYN.

OUR PRESENT PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE. By Montgomery Belgion. Faber and Faber, Ltd. 12s. 6d.

If Bishop Butler were permitted to return to earth at this moment, he would discover an interesting analogy between the present age and his own. Once more it is fashionable in intellectual circles to treat the Christian view of life as finally discredited, and to hail with relief the disappearance of a moral system which has so long interrupted the pleasures of mankind. And today the influence of an alternative philosophy spreads more widely and more rapidly than the influence of Deism in the first half of the eighteenth century. Varying philosophies of the life-force, new types of Naturalism and of scientific or romantic Humanism, compete for the suffrages of the student world, and make their impression on the reading public and on that more elusive creature, the man in the street. How far has the process gone, and how serious are the claims of these modern secular philosophies to acceptance?

This situation is the subject of Mr. Belgion's book, *Our Present Philosophy of Life*. He thinks that within the last thirty years a new philosophy has overthrown the Christian out-

look in the public mind. The mid-Victorians supposed that they could abandon Christian dogmas without disturbing the moral code built upon this foundation. It is now the moral code which is being thrown on one side, and which is being replaced by new moral standards resting on another view of life. The evidence for this reversal of values may be seen in some significant social changes. Mr. Belgion notes first the changes in the relations of adults to children. Our methods of education have been transformed. "Sternness has given place to pampering." Solomon and his rod have yielded to the superior wisdom of Madame Montessori. We aim in education at developing personality rather than building character. Take next the relations of the sexes. Extra-marital sexual relations and divorce are no longer regarded as shameful and sinful, as they were commonly thought to be a generation ago. Then in Mr. Belgion's judgment, class-consciousness is growing more intense, and a narrow nationalism is also on the increase. A declining sense of individual responsibility, and a higher valuation of money and the things money will buy, are characteristic of the present generation. Perhaps most interesting of all is the change in the character of imaginative literature. The modern novel is apt to be purely psychological rather than dramatic or ethical in its interest. "The conflicts formerly portrayed in fiction, the conflicts between God and man in religion, between man and woman in love, and between impulse and duty in man himself . . . have ceased to be material for the novel. The reason is . . . that conflicts of this kind have become unintelligible to the novel-reading public" (p. 20). If this is true, if the conflicts in question are now unintelligible, there must have taken place a profound change in the public's philosophy of life.

The thinkers and writers whom Mr. Belgion selects as most influential in formulating and popularizing our present philosophy of life are Bernard Shaw, André Gide, Freud, and Bertrand Russell. The longest section of the book is devoted to André Gide, and since he is probably least known to English readers, this introduction to the work of a very distinguished and significant French novelist is a valuable feature of Mr. Belgion's discussion of his theme. In essentials, André Gide does not differ from Aldous Huxley, except in being more blindly fascinated by the morbid elements in crime. The general outlook of Aldous Huxley very closely reproduces the position of André Gide. If we ask, what have these writers in common? the answer is, a contempt for conventional morality. All alike have challenged and challenged successfully the Victorian moral standards which inspired the discipline of children, which governed the relations of the sexes, which underlay and de-

fended the industrial and social orders, which guided society in the treatment of crime and the criminal. In each case you have a devastating and even reckless attack on all our moral traditions. . But in spite of Mr. Belgion's treatment of the theme, a distinction may be drawn between Bernard Shaw and the other three. While Shaw is as vehement as any of the others in criticizing conventional morality, he does not throw up the fundamental conception of morality as Gide, Freud, and Bertrand Russell all appear to do. The three latter are seemingly engaged in the rather futile enterprise of rooting the sense of obligation out of human nature, of treating morality and religion as alike illusion. Positively all these writers agree on the free development of one's personality as the great aim in life. "Be yourself," says Bernard Shaw, throwing emphasis on the human will as the highest expression of the life-force. "Be yourself," say André Gide and Aldous Huxley, in the sense of surrendering to your moods and impulses, of living in and for the moment. "Be yourself," says Freud, by avoiding repressions due to conflicts with conventional moral standards. "Be yourself," says Bertrand Russell, by securing for yourself and others the fullest satisfaction of the greatest number of desires. "Do what you will" is the general positive conclusion of the present philosophy of life.

Everyone will recognize that Mr. Belgion's discussion of this important theme is timely. How far is it adequate? It may be doubted whether his diagnosis is profound enough. Do all the symptoms of social change enumerated in his opening chapter belong together and spring from one source? Are all of them evidence of the declining influence of Christianity? Can we not see operating in some of them—the changes in educational method and in the treatment of crime, for example—a more profound understanding of the Christian philosophy of life? When Bertrand Russell takes his stand on reverence for personality as the guiding principle in education, is he not retaining a value-judgment derived from the Christian faith he is seeking to discredit? Certainly he can derive no support for such a principle either from his science or his philosophy. It is not clear that all these changes indicate the overthrow of the Christian view of life or the abandonment of the Christian moral code. The Victorian moral code was far from being fully Christian. At the same time there is a real repudiation of Christianity behind some present changes. Even when some of the changes in themselves should be acceptable to Christians, the grounds on which they are advocated must nevertheless be rejected. A Christian cannot base his demand for further penal reforms on the denial of moral responsibility involved in the

acceptance by Shaw and Russell of Samuel Butler's paradoxical equation of crime with disease in Erewhon. Any fool can see that there is some truth in Butler's paradox, and only very clever original thinkers like Shaw and Russell would be so silly as to suppose or so irresponsible as to suggest that it is the whole truth or the most important truth in regard to crime.

Mr. Belgion's criticism of the writers he selects is acute and valuable, but not always well balanced. He overworks particular quotations, which not only occasions repetition, but suggests that he may be fastening on particular extravagances or purple patches. Many of his criticisms are apparently trifling and verbal, and this is unfortunate, as admirers of Shaw and Russell will dismiss the book as pettifogging. In some instances Mr. Belgion seems to rely on conventional standards of judgment which need a good deal of justification. But when all is said, the book constitutes a shrewd, searching, and serious criticism of the new philosophy of life, particularly as presented by Shaw, Gide, and Bertrand Russell. The inconsistencies and crudities which Mr. Belgion exposes are not superficial, but fundamental weaknesses in the thought of these writers. The startling thing about the new philosophy of life is its sheer intellectual poverty. What a chance for theology!

H. G. Wood.

NOTICES

Prayer in Modern Life. By Francis Underhill, Warden of Liddon House. Mowbray. Price 5s.

Mr. Underhill has succeeded in putting on paper an extraordinarily vivid reflection of his own personality. Vivacity, humour, and common-sense sparkle on every page. A carping critic might complain that it was even too personal. But the author's *métier* is to tell us how things strike him, and he has not the faintest ambition to write a treatise. He meets, on their own ground, the clever, superficial, well-meaning persons who believe in the twentieth century, and conducts them to a new point of view. The wideness of his own interests and of his non-theological reading enable him to do this with great success. But it seems rather a pity that no help is given to those who wish to make use of mental prayer, and hardly know how to set about it. Of course, one volume cannot contain everything, but a little ascetic theology set out as Mr. Underhill could do it would have made the book of more enduring value.

K. D. Mackenzie.

Great Britain and the Slave Trade, 1839-1865. By William Law Mathieson. Longmans. 12s. 6d.

Readers of Dr. Mathieson's previous book, *British Slavery and its Abolition*, will be grateful for this completion of his fine piece of work. The present volume is, however, complete in itself, the earlier history

being skilfully summarized. The crusade—for it was no less—which Great Britain maintained against the horrors of the slave-trade forms one of the threads of international history, a topic as severely ignored in most of our history books as it was in the correspondence of past ambassadors. It came under the heading of commerce, and they resented being employed about such low considerations. As the war upon the slave-trade is here exhibited, it is seen impinging upon many other movements and flashing a kind of searchlight at each point of contact. This interplay is the most valuable feature of the new volume, which, indeed, becomes thereby rather less lucid to the casual reader than the former volume, but exhibits to the student of the nineteenth century a series of new situations of extreme interest.

Apparently constitutional reform in England, France, and Spain in the 'thirties brought with it a sense of justice to the negro. On the other hand, we learn the almost unbelievably sordid details of the protection extended to the slavers by the United States, the far-reaching effects of the Sugar Treaty of 1846, and the not unhumorous tale of the persuading of Brazil.

At home, this thorny topic entailed Gladstone's first political *volte-face*, and Bright's desertion of the ideal of Liberty for the idol of Cotton. The crusading leaders are Palmerston, Russell, and a few eminent lawyers, while their troops are the naval men who patrolled from the West Indies to West Africa for a quarter of a century. But Dr. Mathieson does not deal with his romantic subject as a romancer. This is a grave, documented, and rigorously compressed narrative. Indeed, we would gladly have had a little more of the naval saga, not to mention a few pages on, say, the moral and political effects of sugar, or the influence of Liverpool upon statesmen.

A. D. GREENWOOD.

THE ADVENTURE OF PRAYER. By Father Andrew, S.D.C. Mowbrays. 1s. 6d.

This booklet is valuable far beyond its modest proportions. It is admittedly a primer, and yet one that could be studied with advantage by some who would not consider themselves beginners. It is clear, without being too elementary; a good guide for those who want something more than the directions and prayers supplied by the ordinary manual, but who are not equal to tackling unaided the classics of the more advanced spiritual life. But its special value lies in that it explains and advocates the Sulpician method of meditation. There are many souls who cannot profit by the rigidity of the Ignatian method, who are either "put off" altogether, or struggle vainly to put themselves into unsuitable spiritual postures. The Ignatian method is, directly and indirectly, commended and explained to satiety; it is time that this other method, officially not so venerable but in reality dating very much further back, should step out of the comparative obscurity of the large text-books on prayer and become more known.

V. I. RUFFER.

INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF MYSTICISM. By Margaret Smith. S.P.C.K. 7s.

A valuable feature of this admittedly introductory book is that it surveys the whole field. It is not confined to Christian Mysticism, but

embraces as well Jewish, Classical, Mohammedan, and Oriental manifestations of the universal craving for God. It may be objected that Dr. Smith does not distinguish sufficiently between the Christian and non-Christian aspects. But it would need a larger work to do that adequately, and there are so many books which profess to explain Christian Mysticism, that it is interesting to find a short work which will recognize that, although the Christian aspect is for us supreme, it has its roots and ramifications elsewhere. The best part of the book is the first chapter, The Nature and Meaning of Mysticism, which is a balanced and commendable apologia. But the rest suffers inevitably from the attempt to survey so wide a range in so short a space. Chapter VII., Some Mystics of the Early Middle Ages, gives a particularly sketchy effect, although it deals very well with the three that have been chosen. The early mediæval period cannot be held to be represented by S. Bernard, Richard of S. Victor, and St. Francis, particularly as much shorter periods are treated in equally long chapters. Chapter XI. is most misleadingly named Modern Mysticism—a far better title would have been Later Mysticism. It gives the impression that Mysticism has, in the course of centuries, petered out, particularly in its Christian aspect, whereas it might truly be said to have entered a new period of fecundity. The rare impartiality of treatment has the drawback of making all mystics seem on the same level. The attempt to assess the relative value and richness of different types of mystics is profitless and often impertinent, but it is not only justifiable but even necessary to state, however temperately, that certain mystics have been one-sided or exaggerated. But here nothing is said of the occultism into which Boeme only too often sank from the heights. Nor is there even a hint that the troubles which overwhelmed Madame Guyon and her supporters were largely brought about by that lady's amazing conceit and lack of balance.

It is to be regretted that the author did not develop her survey at greater length. But one hopes that she will one day give us a survey of really modern mysticism. Her impartiality, which is at the same time sympathetic, would make her an admirable exponent.

V. I. RUFFER.

THE IDEALISM OF CHRISTIAN ETHICS. By the Rev. George Walker, M.A., D.D. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1929. 7s.

The ideal text-book on Christian Ethics has yet to be written. The present volume contains the Baird Lectures delivered in Aberdeen. The general plan of treatment is to compare the Christian ideal with other ethical systems. Dr. Walker has given us a clear statement of sound Christian ethical teaching, of a somewhat conventional kind. There is, indeed, far more matter in his pages than might at first appear. But this is not quite the book for which the world is waiting. There is little use of modern psychology. Just those presuppositions of Christian ethics which are widely challenged today are taken for granted. Also we doubt if enough is made of the essentially supernatural nature of the Christian life. Of the theological virtues, faith and hope are barely mentioned till the closing pages. Yet the Christian life is in large part an adventure. And why is "prudence" called wisdom? The reader will get much sound information from these pages, but will hardly be thrilled by the glamour of the Christian ideal or obtain answers to modern difficulties.

E. J. BICKNELL.

THE PLACE OF JESUS CHRIST IN MODERN CHRISTIANITY. By John Baillie, D.Litt. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1929. 7s.

This volume consists of lectures delivered at the Union Theological Seminary, New York. It is a good specimen of the many current attempts made by Liberal Protestants to feel after a new Christology. Professor Baillie writes clearly and concisely, even if he says little that is new. In our opinion the book fails for two reasons. First, it attempts to cover far too much ground, with the result that its treatment of vital elements in the problem is often superficial. Its criticism of Chalcedon, for instance, is almost a travesty. No distinction is made between the psychological approach to the question and the metaphysical issues involved. Nor is sufficient stress laid on the fact that the primary aim of the Council was to rule out error. Secondly, while the writer assigns great weight to the experience of salvation, he almost ignores the side of worship and devotion. His Christ is in the last resort a human being who holds a unique place in the saving purpose of God, and who mediates in a unique way the redeeming love of God; but it is more than doubtful whether we ought to worship Him. Christians have been accustomed to adore Him, "Who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven." That is no doubt picture language, but any restatement of the doctrine of the Incarnation must give it its full value. This book does not, and so far offers us not a modern Christianity, but a substitute for Christianity.

E. J. BICKNELL.

AN DIE RÖMER. By H. Lietzmann. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr. M. 6.

This well-known Commentary on Romans now appears in a third edition. It is instructive to note the changes since its first appearance in 1913. Prefixed to the Commentary is a magnificent Introduction, in 18 pages, to the textual study of the Pauline Epistles. Lietzmann insists that the student must become familiar with textual problems in this limited and comparatively simple field before attacking the terribly hard problems of the Gospels. Various short notes, such as that on "apostle" in i. 1, are enlarged to little essays summarizing the evidence. Discussing "seal" in iv. 11, the first edition said it was a designation for the initiation-rite of circumcision; the advance of Rabbinic studies is reflected now in a warning that the use is not attested earlier than the 4th century A.D. In 1913 Lietzmann did not mention the Creed-formula of viii. 34, which he now finds clearly in the passage. One turns with special interest to xvi., and discovers the objections to the theory that this chapter is part of a letter to Ephesus stated as convincingly as ever. So good and concise a Commentary as this deserves nothing but admiration. The English student needs to supplement Sanday or Headlam, now 25 years old, with Lagrange, the only Commentary Lietzmann singles out for praise, and with Lietzmann himself.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

THE WOMAN OF ANDROS. By Thornton Wilder. Longmans. 6s.

A new book by the author of *The Bridge of San Luis Rey* will be eagerly read, even when it deals with the people of Terence's play, the *Andria*, which is far away from the interests of the great novel-reading public. But in a specialized magazine like ours one must try to bring even this

book somehow or other into the theological orbit, with what success the reader must judge.

I read it immediately after I had finished Mrs. Mitchison's superb *Cloudcuckooland*, which takes one into the very heart of ancient Greece. In it the later stages of the Peloponnesian war, the collapse of Athens, and the triumph of Sparta, are skilfully illustrated by the experiences of an Ionian islander who fights for Athens, afterwards goes to Sparta, and finally joins Cyrus' Greek Army. The story is told from the standpoint of a moderate, who cannot side wholeheartedly with either aristocrats or democrats in his native city and has to flee. He is enthralled by Athens for a while, but recognizes her weaknesses. The finest part of the book is the conflict of emotions in the hero's breast, as he is now attracted, now repelled, by the aristocratic Communism of Sparta. As I read, the analogy to our own times became clear. Athens, on that miniature stage, represents the Western industrialized democracies. Sparta stands for Soviet Russia. The analogy is very close. We have the Spartiates—the ruling Communist party; the great mass of helots in both cases; the ruthless logic of political theory applied without regard to mercy; and the missionary fervour, which in the case of Sparta fostered and maintained oligarchic "cells" all over Greece and Ionia. Sparta won the War, but exhausted herself in the effort. Out of the mass of jarring city states, which had almost bled to death, arose in the fourth century the conception of Hellas as a whole, a spiritual influence in the world rather than a state.

Mr. Wilder takes us into the world of Menander, from whom Terence took his plot. Again we are on an Ægean island, but life is greatly changed. It is eighteenth-century enlightenment following the Wars of Religion. We need Mrs. Mitchison's book to make us realize the presuppositions of Menander's world. Life is duller, grayer, more civilized. The splendours of the Periclean period are past, so are its horrors. Men hold on to the sanctities of life—the family, the local cults—as the one firm anchor, lest they should drift back to the Terror.

A literal war between Russia and the Western democracies is improbable. But a desperate war of ideas is raging and must continue for a long while yet. Eventually it will die down and we shall pass into an age of real internationalism—a Peace of the Augustans. Only, be it noted, such an era will be only a peace of exhaustion, unless the natural pieties, on which supernatural graces are founded, which saved the situation in the third century B.C., continue in our midst.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER